

**SPECIAL MEETING  
COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

**April 3, 2006**

**6:30 PM**

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Lopez, Smith, Forest, DeVries

Messrs.: Mayor Guinta, K. Clougherty, R. Sherman, T. Arnold, F. Thomas,  
J. Hoben, D. Boutillier

Chairman O'Neil advised that the purpose of the special meeting is to discuss the proposal presented by Mayor Guinta regarding reorganization of the administration of Traffic and Parking responsibilities.

Chairman O'Neil stated for the record we did get information from the Highway and Traffic Departments and Finance did include information that we should have received on Friday. It was a separate item that didn't make it into the agenda. Deputy City Clerk Johnson is down copying the Mayor's information that he had previously submitted. With that, I would invite the Mayor up.

Mayor Guinta stated good evening members of the Committee and thank you very much for hearing this proposal. I certainly hope...I would like to reiterate that the idea I had essentially was to try to be much more efficient in City government in how we administer services while trying to maintain the level of service that I think people have come to expect in the City of Manchester. It is not an easy feat to try to find and identify new ways to deliver services but the plan that I have written that is before you for consideration is what I hope will be utilized as a blueprint for this Committee to make recommendations as this Committee sees fit to the full Board. I certainly understand that this has been somewhat of a challenge to some members...a challenging time for some members of the department and City employees. First and foremost I would like to say that this is in no way about personalities. It is about trying to better and more effectively manage City services in City departments. I have high regard for the people in the positions that we are going to be talking about and I want to make sure that this Committee understands that and at least hears it directly from me. That being said, after some consideration once the Director, Tom Lolicata, came to notify me

of his retirement I looked at the obvious question that I think has faced the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for many years and many times in the past, which is what do we do with the department and is this an appropriate time to consider either changing functions or changing the organization of the department or consolidating the department. When I took a look at the parking study recommendations and I looked at the department functions and I looked at the Highway functions I felt that there was an ability to redirect some of the services and some of the functions within the Traffic Department to other areas. Let me reiterate that right now there are three or four essential services that the Traffic Department is charged with – traffic signals, traffic signs, pavement markings and parking management. So I look at it as four...I think the Deputy Director categorized them as three functions. The one large function I see is parking management. I have, during the budget, suggested through the recommendations of our parking consultant and parking study established a parking enterprise fund. I think that could be far more effective in how we manage parking in the City, not just now but in the future, particularly how we grow. We are looking at having less garages than we did just four short years ago when I joined the Board. I am not sure what parking is going to look like in the future but I certainly think that given the complexity of parking in the City and the changing dynamics of the City almost on an annual basis a parking enterprise fund to me makes sense. Obviously for your consideration during the budget process that function has been removed from the department. That leaves the Traffic Department with two major functions – traffic signals and traffic signs and pavement markings. In my opinion I feel that one department is not...one sole entity is not necessary for the completion of those functions and they could be easily rolled into another department. If you look at the dollar savings summary sheet that I had recommended in my proposal I did eliminate the Director's position upon retirement. I would phase out the Deputy position. I would phase out the Administrative Services Manager, which would move over to the parking enterprise system. So out of those three positions you are looking at a reduction of workforce or a reduction of one individual. One by retirement, one by this proposal, and then one who would move into the parking enterprise. Numbers 4-7 I would be reassigning the parking meters to the enterprise. I would be reducing the signing and painting by one technician if this Committee so chose. You can replace that with a painting contractor. If you choose not to do that, either way there is no cost. I would also keep the three signal technicians that we have in place now despite the fact that only about a year ago we added a third given the health issues of one individual. We decided not to go back down to the two. I have maintained the three due to public safety reasons and for fairness to the employees at that level we should keep three at this time. So there is no cost to that decision. In the plan that I proposed you are looking at about a \$418,000 savings. Depending on how we move forward with contracting line painting I think there could probably be a greater savings because you are not going to have the long-term costs or health costs that are associated with an

employee but more importantly you are not going to have the costs associated with the truck that we need and the tools that we need. If you do contract that out, I think there would be significant savings. I do believe based on the number of functions in this department it probably does make sense to move...after you move the parking management into a parking enterprise and those employees I do believe it makes sense to consolidate. You are looking at about 10 employees that remain and I don't think that for a department with these two basic functions that they need a stand-alone department. I think the proper oversight could be served by the Highway Department and I would certainly hope that this Committee would take this into consideration. I would be happy to answer your questions regarding my proposal.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have any more information. There seems to be some confusion on this number of people in the signal division. Do you have any new information since you presented this?

Mayor Guinta answered I did just ask the deputy that question and as I understand it we have one Signal Supervisor and two Signal Technicians.

Chairman O'Neil asked does that mean they lost the laborer's position. I guess we can get that information when they come up because I know there was some confusion about that.

Alderman DeVries stated your Honor maybe you can help me understand a couple of things you said that were somewhat in conflict with the proposal that you gave us. First when you mentioned the Deputy Director's position you switched the language from elimination to phase out. Maybe you could clarify how you propose dealing with that.

Mayor Guinta responded what I said was eliminate the Deputy Director and then phase out the Administrative Services Manager, which would then be moved over to the parking enterprise fund.

Alderman DeVries asked so it is a straight elimination.

Mayor Guinta answered of the Deputy's position yes. I am still recommending that and then when I say phase out of the Administrative Services Manager position, depending on what this Committee does if there is a consolidation and the parking enterprise, for example, doesn't go through I would look at phasing out that position. Again, it depends on what the final consolidation would be. In the current proposal I think that the Administrative Services Manager position is necessary in the parking enterprise fund and would move that function and that individual to that enterprise.

Alderman DeVries asked so when you built your budget this year did you take those numbers out of there.

Mayor Guinta answered I did so if this does not go through then it would impact...we would have to take a look at how that changes through the budget process. Any change that this Committee makes would impact that number positively or negatively. The total dollar savings amount that I have here is reflected in my proposed budget. If there is an amendment or a change up or down that would have to be reflected in the budget.

Alderman DeVries asked and when you built your budget you did not include the potential for unemployment compensation received by the individual that we are laying off or I guess it is three individuals. Was that built into your budget because they would be, under state law, eligible for 26 weeks or half a year's salary?

Mayor Guinta answered I don't believe that was in my budget, however, I would have to...I want to say that we have an account for...I would have to check with Harry but I think we have an account for that.

Alderman DeVries stated I am not too clear myself but I think it is part of the salary line item and maybe another department head that is with us can clarify that for us. You also indicate as a savings the line painting truck as a \$200,000 potential savings but within that paragraph you talk about potentially using it until the end of its life because there is, apparently, some life left in that piece of machinery.

Mayor Guinta responded there is. I have not reflected the \$200,000 savings in the dollar savings summary sheet. I am looking at potential future savings. One of the benefits, I think, of consolidating the department or contracting out that responsibility is you have reduced manpower and a reduction in the cost of equipment. That would be an example of the reduction in the cost of equipment. Clearly the truck is at the end of its life and we are going to have to replace it sooner rather than later. I have not budgeted for the replacement of this but if the Board so chose that it needed replacement over some of the other priorities that I listed, the Board could certainly make that recommendation.

Alderman DeVries asked the question is within your budget when you built the Traffic Department budget you did not build in the contractual amount of \$53,000 for the contract into the budget because you are assuming there is still some life left in the line painting.

Mayor Guinta answered it is one or the other. If we so chose to contract it out, it would be roughly the cost of the one tech position so at the moment I am leaving the tech position there. If we so chose at some point, upon a retirement for example, I would still keep that money in there for a contract basis thinking in the short-term we could still use the truck because it does have some life in it but in the future we wouldn't have to replace the cost of that truck because we would then be contracting out the service.

Alderman DeVries stated you can understand the confusion when we try to figure out what you actually built into your budget because you did eliminate when you look at your savings that you are proposing, that line tech position salary is claimed on the sheet so I would have assumed you didn't built that into the budget.

Mayor Guinta responded well it is either one or the other. Number 5 and 6...it really doesn't make a difference because in one area you have \$53,000 and in the next line you have the \$53,000 so it is one or the other.

Alderman DeVries asked so it is fair to say that the \$418,000 is not a hard and fast number.

Mayor Guinta answered no I think that is an accurate number.

Alderman DeVries asked so you either use it to keep the machinery...it is semantics. That's okay.

Mayor Guinta stated the \$53,000 is either for a tech or for a contract and for the moment I am recommending keeping the technician but in the future, say upon retirement for example, we would still keep the \$53,000 but have a future savings of the \$200,000 of the vehicle that we wouldn't have to replace. In the MER budget, I think I have \$1.33 million that I have budgeted and I am not at this point recommending a replacement truck for FY07. Again, I don't think it has to be replaced this year but it has to be replaced within the next two or three years.

Alderman Lopez asked regarding assigning the parking to the Economic Development Director, back in 1992 that was assigned to John Hoben who was the City Coordinator and after awhile they kicked it back to the Traffic Department. There was an ordinance adopted back in 1992. I don't particularly have that much of a problem with the Economic Development Department...that could be a very good place for it but what makes us want to hire somebody else when we have qualified employees to do...they have been doing parking and we will talk about Traffic later but they have been doing parking in the City for a long time and I am just wondering why we need somebody else of so called high caliber to come into the City of Manchester.

Mayor Guinta answered what I have done is recommending the management of transition would be assigned to the Economic Development Office. I am not saying it would stay there forever. That is just the transition. In terms of the position itself, anybody who is deemed qualified by the Human Resources Department can apply. If deemed qualified that would include the Deputy Director. In my opinion I think there is a big difference between running an existing department and trying to manage an enterprise that is responsible not only for setting overall parking management and trying to maximize parking management but also who is responsible and charged with addressing revenues, not just to pay for itself but I also am expecting an additional revenue back to the City after the enterprise expenses are paid for. To me, again that would be a decision by the Human Resources Director but in my opinion it is a position that would require more overall parking management skills.

Alderman Lopez stated well I don't know what these parking management skills are but I know that an individual has been doing that ever since I have been involved in the City of Manchester.

Mayor Guinta replied anyone deemed qualified by the HR Director could certainly apply.

Alderman Lopez stated I am a little puzzled as to why Harry and the HR Director are not here to give us some input on personnel issues. Were they notified of this meeting?

Mayor Guinta responded I am not aware if they were notified or not.

Chairman O'Neil stated they were not asked by me to be here. I asked the four groups – the Mayor, Traffic, Finance and Highway to be here.

Mayor Guinta stated I am sure they would be happy to come to a future meeting of the Committee.

Chairman O'Neil stated I am hopeful that we can keep some dialogue open after tonight and that can be a follow-up meeting and we can invite the HR Director and who else did you say, the Risk Manager.

Alderman Lopez answered yes. There is a question of 26 weeks of unemployment.

Chairman O'Neil stated we can have both of them here at a meeting to follow this at some point.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a question for the Finance Officer in reference...

Chairman O'Neil interjected can we stay with the Mayor while he is here. Is it just one question and then you are going to want to go back to the Mayor?

Alderman Lopez responded yes. Kevin, could you explain to the Committee about the \$1 million taken from the Center of NH parking garage to fund an operation when we have been told on many occasions that could not be done?

Kevin Clougherty, Finance Director, replied I am not quite sure what your question is.

Alderman Lopez stated well the Mayor has used a portion of the proceeds from the sale of the Center of NH parking garage to fund a \$1 million CIP...how can we use it when this money goes into a one time account.

Mr. Clougherty responded that is what we are talking about Alderman. My understanding is that if it is the will of the Board...one of the recommendations you will recall of the parking study was to invest in more current technology and better parking meters so that we could do a better job of managing the flow of traffic in the downtown and enhance our revenue capacity. The estimate at the time was about \$1 million for those to get started with the economic development investment. That is what we said that the one time revenue will be used for economic development and for capital. If you want to move forward with the enterprise one of the key elements is going to be having the necessary technology out there to make it work so those go hand in hand. I don't necessarily see it as inconsistent but I guess that is the piece of the question I didn't understand.

Alderman Lopez stated well I think it is inconsistent because I can remember on many occasions it was always we don't fund operational items.

Mr. Clougherty replied I agree Alderman but this is being used for capital.

Alderman Lopez stated just a minute. I think we are talking about \$6 million that he is going to put into the parking fund. Is that correct? The revenue?

Mr. Clougherty responded right. Once you get started with the enterprise that would be the revenues that are generated from your parking operations that now go into the general fund. You would have your enterprise and those dollars would go into it. You would have, as the Mayor mentioned, a few hundred thousand dollars of expenses and then after that the balance could come back as a revenue to the general fund.

Alderman Lopez stated well the balance. Is that going to be the intent? I was talking to Randy Sherman a couple of years ago and he said maybe 55% of the revenue would cover a parking fund so I think in talking to Kevin Buckley, the ordinance if we go this route would be built upon percentage of the revenue. If we are going to get \$6 million then a percentage of that could go to the parking fund and the rest would come back to the City in the general fund.

Mr. Clougherty responded all of those things are available. What the Mayor has laid out is what he felt comfortable with, which was a split in that regard. We are perfectly willing to come back and give you some more detail on that and explain what the flows might be and how this would work. Again, it is a process. He has made some recommendations and the Board is going to take a look at it. There may be some things that you want to do a little bit different.

Mayor Guinta stated it was hard for me to quantify this into percentages because again it is a recommendation. I am recommending doubling the amount of PCO's but if we decide not to do that then the cost of the PCO's would be less than my recommendation. So the way that I quantified it was whatever expenses the parking enterprise needed to run first would be paid by the revenues that it received. Anything over and above that after some amount of contingency for maybe additional future capital costs and maintenance would then come back to the City general fund. If this Committee prefers to put it in a percentage based I am certainly open to that and would support it.

Alderman Lopez stated I think next time we meet we need some idea of what the cost is and what we are really talking about if we went to a parking...back to the way it was before with John Hoben.

Mr. Clougherty responded what happened with John as you recall is he just got overwhelmed because of the time it takes to run that one function, that parking function and it was his recommendation at the time that somebody be put in charge of that. That is why it was taken from him but also at the time I think the composition of what we had for parking assets was different. We had more garages. We have taken some action in that regard so now what you need for a reserve would be different. Those are certainly reasonable questions that I would be happy to give you the details on. As you know I just want to remind the Committee that we have been meeting with I think the Traffic Committee and the Committee on Accounts to talk about bringing the consultant back and we made a list of questions for him to answer. We have scheduled him to come back on April 17. He has already bought a plane ticket.



Alderman Lopez stated I think you better check with Alderman Gatsas on that because...

Mr. Clougherty interjected anyway if he comes back to do some of that work he would be available to talk to you.

Alderman Lopez stated your Honor do you anticipate the parking manager...maybe I missed it but would that person report to you or the Economic Development Director.

Mayor Guinta responded I think there are probably benefits to both. I think there are benefits for oversight from the Mayor's office and I think there are benefits from the Economic Development office. I would caution that I do think that parking is an economic development tool but I wouldn't want the Economic Development office, especially as it is currently constituted, to take over the oversight of it essentially because they have to focus on economic development retention and some of the new projects that we are hopefully expecting to see this year or next year, which I think is also the critical reason to hire an experienced parking manager who would then be responsible to me and ultimately the Board of Aldermen. Again, I think we could hash that issue out a little bit but I would be concerned right now providing direct or complete oversight from the Economic Development office only because right now you are down to Paul and Lisa part-time. I don't know that he can handle his functions as currently staffed let alone a new enterprise.

Alderman Lopez stated well if we go that route it might be an area to explore because you might not need a high paid individual to do that whereby a qualified individual, an Economic Director, he cannot do economics unless he does parking and by having direct control in that particular area might be a solution. I just want to throw that out there.

Alderman Forest stated I have a few questions. The first thing, Mr. Mayor, on item 2 you are talking about the elimination of the Deputy Director's position. The question I have is we may table this or pass this or whatever but if as a scenario we pass this tonight and it goes to the full Board at their next meeting does that mean that the Deputy Director would be done.

Mayor Guinta asked at the next Board meeting.

Alderman Forest answered yes if we pass it and say okay this is what we are going to do that means the next day the Deputy Director would be looking for a position.

Mayor Guinta responded well I hadn't thought that it would move that quickly quite frankly.

Alderman Forest replied well I don't think it is going to move that quickly but I am just using it...

Mayor Guinta interjected I will say this. If it had moved that quickly I wouldn't expect this to happen probably until FY07. I think first and foremost you have to have a smooth transition within the Traffic Department as it exists today. I think we have to recognize the years of service of this position and I think we also have a responsibility, particularly from my office, to aid and assist in any employment opportunities either within or outside of the City. That would take a few months and I certainly would expect that not to happen until FY07.

Alderman Forest stated I have a little problem with that but that is for another day. Some of the other comments and questions I have are back in 2001 when I was elected that was one of my pet peeves as far as the parking organization in this City. I know that I fought a lot for the lock box system and I fought a lot to get this study done and now it seems to be working. There are a lot of good things in your plan. I don't agree with all of it. One of them and I was looking for the letter, there was a letter here and I am not sure if it was from your office or somewhere else about setting up a parking control manager under the North Carolina or South Carolina system...

Chairman O'Neil interjected that might have been from the consultant.

Alderman Forest stated the question I have on that is I know I visited Portland, Portsmouth, Concord, Boston and everything else. Has your office done this? Have they checked with other cities as far as their parking control manager and how they run their operation?

Mayor Guinta responded no. I am relying right now on the parking study we did and my overall assessment of how we deliver services today. If that is something the Board would like my office to undertake, we would be happy to do it.

Alderman Forest stated I believe that if parts of this are implemented I think we should go within our state or within our region. I have gone and interviewed quite a few of these parking control managers over the past three years.

Mayor Guinta stated it might be a benefit not just for myself but for some of the Aldermen who are interested whether this Committee or the Public Safety and Traffic Committee to do a joint effort. I would be happy to do it.

Alderman Forest stated let me voice my objections about this proposal and my objection is the fact that we have at least two employees here in this department that have been here a very long time. I know you are probably going to make arrangements for one of them but you want to eliminate one position. The Deputy Director has been here for well over 30 years and personally I cannot see voting to eliminate that person's job when he is very close to retirement. Put him somewhere else doing this job and everything else. I would totally vote against this mainly because of this one item. That is my comment.

Alderman DeVries stated your Honor I just heard you indicate that the Deputy's position you would consider looking at a FY07 termination of the position. I guess it takes me back to the first question that I had for you which is that is kind of a phase out because that is half a year's salary that you are indicating you would carry through on that position. So it is fair to say that we should be carrying at least a half year's salary in our budget...you can tell where my mind is focused this week with the budget proposal before us.

Mayor Guinta responded well the question that was raised is if this passes at the next BMA meeting what would happen and the funding in the FY06 budget, the current budget, still exists for all of the employees that exist in the department so I am not advocating the elimination of that position next week. I would say to be fair the beginning of FY07 where it is not funded in the budget. That would be to me a much more appropriate cut off. It is currently funded in the FY06 budget. We do have funds and as far as I am concerned whether this passes tomorrow or next week or if only portions of it pass I wouldn't be eliminating that position until that time.

Alderman DeVries asked the support staff that you might envision for MEDO or the traffic czar. Do you have a vision that they will need additional support staff in that office?

Mayor Guinta answered I think they are going to need anywhere, after the PCO's and the manager if that manager is identified, you are going to need anywhere from one to three people depending on how the office is shaped. Again, those individuals I think have to either...the Board of Mayor and Aldermen have to come up with or this Committee would have to come up with an appropriate structure whether it is before we hire the manager or hire a manager or identify a manager to take on that responsibility and have the recommendation from the manager and then we as a policy board have to make that decision. It is a bit challenging to say exactly today what it would look like because many people would probably run it differently. The expenses for those individuals would all come out of the enterprise fund.

Alderman DeVries asked did you follow-up because you mentioned the parking control officers and I noticed back in the original Highway Department proposal that they had indicated an increase in the PCO's. Today that is a function that is overseen by Police and those are actually certified to some level officers. It is a very difficult position for them to employ. Within your proposal I would assume you are also looking to move those parking control officers out of the Police Department?

Mayor Guinta answered in my budget I did. Right now the Police line item does not reflect those positions.

Alderman DeVries asked did you research the state statute issues that came to light the last time we talked about moving those officers here into City Hall under the City Clerk's Office because they have to follow state statutes for police enforcement. I thought there were some conflicts for them not being certified police officers.

Mayor Guinta answered I am not aware if there are any...if the function remains but they are moved to a different department or enterprise I am not aware that any legislative changes would be necessary.

Alderman DeVries asked so your vision is that they stay as certified police or whatever certification they have.

Mayor Guinta answered the existing ones yes but whether we would need that level of certification in the future I think would be up to the HR Committee, the Administration Committee or the parking manager or whoever runs the enterprise fund.

Alderman DeVries stated also predicated in the proposal that you have given us, your Honor, the parking fees need to be increased to have the revenues that you suggest with the enterprise system and I think that was part of the proposal that we saw in the draft proposal that was given to us. We need to realign and get market...I think that is the term that you used and others have used that we need to bring all of our fees up to market rate so there is an increase in those fees.

Mayor Guinta responded I think we have to have an honest look at fees in the City. One of the recommendations that I looked at quite honestly for a long time having been the Ward 3 Alderman I have traditionally been opposed, at least during my years as Alderman, to fee increases. The reason for that has always been my concern during that economic development stage and improvements to downtown I didn't want to stop the construction and sort of rebirth as a result of increasing parking. I think now you have a good 10-year window to look at

downtown. I have done a little bit of research on my own and think that we are in a different stage now than we were even four years ago. I think that the parking rates are certainly lower than what they could be in certain areas. Again, part of the revenue increase is not just increasing parking it is...if you buy the improved technology it allows for an individual to pay the meter for the time used, which is not happening right now. If you put a quarter in and you leave, someone comes in and gets that time. Smart Meters or improved technology, whatever term you want to use, would not allow for that. So potentially you would be renting the space as a consumer for the amount of time you are actually parking rather than paying for yourself and the next person coming in behind you. So there is an increase in the revenue just for that improvement in technology but also looking at different areas in the City and determining if some of the fees should be altered whether it is at different times during the day or just different geographic sections. Again, I think the parking manager is the individual who would have oversight over that responsibility.

Alderman DeVries stated you and I don't disagree that certainly there are upgrades to our system that have to occur and I think the study that we performed last year has given us a good direction to follow as you said with Smart Meters and tailoring our parking to fit the business needs of the community but whether we need to overhaul or switch one group of employees for a new group of employees if that technology was put in place we would still have those increased revenues and the department would still have a whole different cash flow balance sheet. It has nothing to do with the employees that are pushing the pencils and driving the mission. It has more to do with us implementing the policy given to us in this parking study.

Mayor Guinta responded I understand that approach and I would agree with it in part. I do think that the overall management system is just as important as the system itself and I think Victory garage is an example of that. We as a Board have debated over the last several years about the management of it. Could it be improved whether through different employees or a different management company or a different accountability system? We all have our different views on that but clearly I think based on the study there was a direct...how do I say it. The study identified certainly dramatic areas of improvement in terms of oversight, not just solely based on information and knowledge but that was certainly a component. If we just improve the technology will you see an increase in revenue? Yes I think you probably will but I also think it is equally and vitally important to establish the enterprise fund. Also in part because the enterprise fund...one of the things when I look at the overall budget I have to not just consider the department itself but some of the long term management issues that we have to deal with as a City and one of them is our debt capacity and our debt service. When you obviously move things out of the general obligation or revenue

bonds and put them into an enterprise fund it further allows us the ability to bond on other things and right now between our debt service and our interest on debt we are at about \$14 or \$13.5 million. In my opinion we have to get that number...I would like to see it south of \$10 million but it is not going to happen overnight. That is just the City side. On the school side we have \$11 million. So part of how I am looking at this too in establishing the enterprise fund is to try to relieve some of the future debt service payments that I think we may have relating to parking construction.

Alderman DeVries asked your Honor are you staying for this meeting or are you leaving us immediately thereafter because one important piece before you leave the meeting that I would like you to weigh in on would be the traffic engineer, which was part of the proposal in our package.

Mayor Guinta answered I can talk about that now. I will stay as long as I need to. Obviously I am trying to give as much information as I can and then let the other departments give there...and I am happy to stay for that or I am happy to allow them the flexibility to do that without my presence. I want to make sure that everybody speaks openly and honestly about this issue. I would be happy to stay.

Alderman DeVries stated maybe you can answer that one question before you move on.

Mayor Guinta responded Frank Thomas has recommended that we include that position. Quite honestly I think we need the position. The concern that I have is that I don't believe at the moment we have the money for this. So my recommendation would be and again if this consolidation in part or in whole goes through I would see that individual more as someone who deals with reconstruction and traffic flows and I would see that more in the Highway Department. I would expect that if we saw a retirement or somebody leave, one of the existing engineers, I would then hire rather than that existing position I would look to hire a traffic engineer rather than the existing engineer.

Alderman Forest stated first following up on the PCO's going into the Economic Development office and I know Alderman DeVries asked about the authority. Now I believe and I am not 100% sure but I believe that because of privacy laws and federal laws that the state police in NH will not give out information to anyone other than law enforcement. Therefore, if a parking control manager in that office is moved to any other location but the Police Department there is certain information that they will not be able to get like traffic violations now because of Dale Robinson who is there they give him the authority to go out and get listings on owners of cars and stuff like that to collect money owed to the City but if it goes to Highway or Economic Development I believe the laws will not

allow anyone other than law enforcement to get that information so you may want to look into that.

Mayor Guinta replied I am not aware of it but I will look into it and have an answer for this Committee before you have made your final recommendation. We will start researching that and get it to you as soon as we are able to identify if there is an RSA. I will identify the RSA and what steps would have to be taken in order to address that.

Alderman Forest stated the other question I have which was brought up is about the traffic engineer. I know you mentioned or Alderman O'Neil mentioned about the engineer for the flow of traffic and roads and all of that. I can see the flow of traffic but there are a lot of professional parking control managers in this country and I am not sure what all of the criteria is but I don't think one of them is building roads.

Mayor Guinta responded no that would be the function of the engineer to sort of reconstruct exits and streets to try to relieve traffic pressures or high accident areas. The one example that I think probably comes to my mind because it is in downtown but probably many people who work downtown is the interchange to get onto Bridge Street. I happen to live there as well so it is very...you can only get on to Bridge Street one way. I think the traffic engineer would be the kind of individual who would look at that, not really intersection, but that exit and entrance ramp and try to reconfigure it not only to allow a better flow of traffic because the cars are backed up all the way down to Canal Street at certain times of the morning and afternoon. That individual would be responsible for identifying spots within the City that should be reconstructed. That individual working in house could then give us the priority list and we could fund it through the CIP and I don't know if the enterprise fund would allow it but at the very least we would do it through CIP.

Alderman Lopez stated when you get the information that has been requested could we get your vision...I think Randy Sherman signed this on Item 3 you talk about Columbia, SC. Do you agree with his statement on that that is the model you want to...that is on the parking study. Do you agree with that?

Mayor Guinta replied essentially what this says is the parking division proposed by myself follows the Columbia, SC model. I am not saying that we need to implement every aspect of the South Carolina model. There is a similar model that exists and is working effectively in South Carolina.

Alderman Lopez stated I was wondering if you could give us an organizational chart that you think it should be.

Mayor Guinta responded I can provide that to you but again I think that would be more of a blueprint. I would sort of defer that responsibility, that final responsibility, probably to the parking manager but I can certainly give this Committee an idea of what I think it should look like and then the Committee can make a recommendation as well.

Alderman Lopez stated I just have to ask in reference to this engineer that everybody keeps talking about over a number of years we have used I think Southern NH Services when we had a traffic problem and they come in and do a study and all of that and most of the time we follow their recommendations, along with the Highway Department. I just don't know what another traffic engineer is going to do for us that we don't already do.

Mayor Guinta responded we pay a fee to belong to the Southern NH Planning Commission and as a result of that fee we utilize their services in that fashion that you talk about. I had the same...originally I shared the same viewpoint that you did that if we can utilize an existing service that we are already paying for why do you need to hire somebody in house. Now again I did not include that individual in my proposal because of that very reason. I also will recognize that the Southern NH Planning Commission has far more of a geographic area to work on than just Manchester. I don't know if they have 100% of the resources that can be dedicated to the type of job that we as a Board of Mayor and Aldermen would be looking at. I am sort of leaving that open for the Board to review at some point later because I do think that is a policy decision. I also recognize that Frank Thomas believes that it is a necessary position. I value his opinion so my middle ground there is if it is necessary let's take a...at some point because we can't do everything in this budget process but at some point let's look at the number of engineers that we have and make sure that we are properly staffed and if there is a departure in that area and it is so determined by this Committee and the HR Committee that we should in fact bring that in house then at least there would be a slot or placeholder for it so there is a negligible tax impact to the City.

Alderman Lopez stated my final thing is I know that the City Clerk's Office did a study recently or last year in reference to the parking aspect of it and the ordinance division. There is a letter somewhere from the state saying that we couldn't do that. Could you get documentation or have your staff get documentation on these enforcement officers so that we can make a decision with all the facts?

Mayor Guinta responded I will.

Alderman Shea stated we heard a lot about the word enterprise. Could you explain for the general public listening what you mean by an enterprise?



Mayor Guinta responded sure. An enterprise fund is a separate entity that does not have a direct impact on the general fund or the borrowing or debt capacity of the City of Manchester itself.

Alderman Shea asked how doesn't it have a direct impact.

Mayor Guinta answered because the bonds would be sold through the enterprise fund or the enterprise system backed by the revenues that are generated by the enterprise system. Currently as the Traffic Department exists any bonding that we have to do would be done through CIP and through general obligation bonds. Therefore, it would have an impact on the overall amount that we could borrow and our borrowing capacity and bond rating. Once you move things out of the enterprise, whether it is the Airport, Water Works, EPD or some of the Parks & Recreation enterprise funds, that would be in a different accounting column essentially and it doesn't impact the overall amount that you can bond. Again, this is the example of Gill Stadium that I know is a challenging issue for some of us but right now if we have to bond to repair the roof and it is removed from the Parks & Recreation enterprise fund it now would have to be funded through CIP Table 3 I think or Table 4, which has an impact to the amount that we can bond and our tax rate. If it is bonded through one of the other tables under the enterprise it is in a separate accounting column. They can get it done and it doesn't have any impact on the overall CIP number or the tax rate.

Alderman Shea asked whether we bond through the CIP or whether we bond through the enterprise who is responsible for paying for the bonding.

Mayor Guinta answered the entity that is requesting the bond so for example if the parking enterprise needs to bond for a \$2 million project to improve infrastructure, they are responsible for the payment through the revenues of the department itself or of the enterprise itself.

Alderman Shea stated now right now we don't have an enterprise for departments so where do the revenues go that we get now from parking. Where does that money go?

Mayor Guinta replied it goes to the City general fund. When I did the FY07 budget you will see in the Traffic Department a reduction in the amount they are funded and the amount of their revenues because that revenue was placed in the enterprise fund.

Alderman Shea asked do the revenues that we get for the parking right now help to reduce taxes for the common taxpayer.

Mayor Guinta answered I believe...I would have to go check my numbers again but I believe there is a small amount – less than \$500,000 I believe but to give you a specific number I would have to go back to my budget book.

Alderman Shea asked so in other words the Traffic Department revenues only reduce the taxes by \$500,000.

Mayor Guinta answered again before I could give you an exact number I would have to check my budget book but I don't think it reduces...

Alderman Shea interjected right now so that I am clear...

Mayor Guinta interjected the revenues are higher than \$500,000 but your question...I didn't think it was what the revenues were.

Alderman Shea asked does that money go into the general fund to reduce the tax rate.

Mayor Guinta answered but they also go into the general fund to pay for the department itself so that is offset.

Alderman Shea stated so basically whatever funding we get beyond the expenditures for the operation of the Traffic Department then the rest of the revenues like any other department would go to reduce the tax rate. When we set up an enterprise those monies would not all go...in other words some of that money would have to go to the enterprise fund in order for the enterprise fund to exist. Is that correct?

Mayor Guinta responded yes similarly to how the Traffic Department exists now. If you want to look at the revenues that come in and the expenses that we pay for the Traffic Department and the rest comes to the general fund for our decision as to how we want to spend it. With a parking enterprise by law the funds do have to go to fund the enterprise but then you can also set up the enterprise that any dollar amount over either a certain percentage or after a certain expenditure or the expenditures have been met they can still come back to the general fund, which is how I propose setting up the enterprise. So not only have we segregated the enterprise fund and the future bonding needs but we also still have a mechanism by which the City is receiving their revenues. My hope is that with a professional management system in place we would see increased revenues based on the overall management of the parking system.

Alderman Shea stated I guess the question that I have would be when you do not have an enterprise to begin with who pays the expense of that enterprise. We have no enterprise now. Where does the money come from?

Mayor Guinta responded the general fund.

Alderman Shea asked have you put that into your budget because when you outlined here you have a savings you said of whatever - \$418,780 but when I look at this obviously the Director has left, the elimination of the Deputy's position is \$94,991 and the Administrative Services Manager you said could go into the enterprise so I don't know what her...

Mayor Guinta interjected it is a savings on the tax side because the salary and benefits for that individual is now moved from the general fund into the enterprise fund so it is paid for out of the enterprise. Now there is an offset on the revenue side also.

Alderman Shea stated the other people that can't be assigned...I guess if the information \$141,533 so you subtract that so basically when you say you are saving \$418,780 you are probably saving the retirement of Tom Lolicata, which I am sure we all understand and if this other Deputy's position is eliminated but it is not really...I am not sure but it is not really \$418,780. If \$141,533 cannot be transferred to the enterprise but has to remain in the Traffic Department...in essence I am not sure if this total figure is...

Mayor Guinta interjected again the figure I submitted of \$418,780 in savings assumes that this Committee accepts the recommendations that I have submitted to it and it is implemented in the FY07 budget. If parts of it are recommended or approved then we would have to do a calculation as to what the savings would be.

Alderman Shea responded right that is what I am trying to indicate.

Mayor Guinta stated this is just a dollar savings based on the recommendations that I have. I am asking the Committee to look at my recommendation and have the discussions amongst the Committee and whatever that...I hope that we can come to some sort of compromise. Obviously one Alderman has already indicated that...

Alderman Shea interjected if that \$141,533 cannot be transferred to the enterprise have you included that in some phase of your budget or will you have to include that.

Mayor Guinta stated that is included right now in the parking enterprise in my budget.

Alderman Shea asked so what would we have to change in your figures.

Mayor Guinta answered well it depends on what you approve. If you do not approve number 4...

Alderman Shea interjected well if we can't do it because of the legal implications involved I am just asking where would you put that.

Mayor Guinta stated it would have to go back into the general fund.

Alderman Shea asked under what department.

Mayor Guinta stated that would either be Traffic or...

Alderman Shea interjected well if Traffic didn't exist.

Mayor Guinta stated then it would go to Highway I guess. Again we would have to talk about it as a Committee.

Alderman Shea stated I was just wondering. Thank you.

Alderman Roy stated I have heard the word assumptions and working out details quite a bit tonight but one of my biggest concerns...per the Charter we have a pretty tight timeframe with our budget. You got into office and you started working on it right away. To establish the parking enterprise and to find a parking czar that has been referred to and to possibly move over employees and get this system going for FY07 which starts in a few months what is your ideal timeframe. When do you want to go out to RFP? When do you need decisions from this Board and what can be delayed and added into the FY07 budget so that timeframes and this can be done correctly?

Mayor Guinta responded I think we can do it a number of ways. I think if the Committee so desires that an enterprise fund is necessary we can move forward with portions of this recommendation. There is nothing really that stops us from an HR perspective of actually going out and inquiring about hiring people. I mean there would be two separate...we could tomorrow say we are looking to hire a parking enterprise fund manager. I think in order to do that we would have to have some sense of agreement of the Board that that enterprise would exist. We are certainly not going to...we don't have the capability of hiring somebody until it exists but you could start much like we do with Police, start the hiring process

far before making the final agreement on when the enterprise fund begins. Again, if this Committee all believes through its deliberations that the parking enterprise fund makes sense and you want to move that to the full Board that can be approved when this Committee makes that decision and then we can go out and look for the highest and best qualified individual probably in the month of April and start that process. I believe that we could find, after a quick search, someone for the job.

Alderman Roy asked so even though some of our department heads like Economic Development have taken six to eight months or a year and other department head positions have been left open for...

Mayor Guinta interjected well that one was I think for more political disagreement on the Board of Aldermen. Again, I was on the Board with you at the time and there was a lot of discussion about whether we needed that position. This is a little bit different in the sense that first and foremost it will be an enterprise so there is not a tax impact and I think after the recommendation from a study we have ample evidence that okay this is the direction we should be moving in in the City. We are a large enough City now and we are a destination City so we probably do need to look at this. I think it is very, very different than the discussions that were going on about a year ago with economic development.

Alderman Roy asked the positions that you talked about eliminating on the first couple of pages and then a couple of phasing outs on your dollar savings summary, have you met with those employees prior to bringing this to the public. What was that negotiation or what was that discussion?

Mayor Guinta answered no I didn't.

Alderman Roy asked has anyone at HR talked to them about what would happen if this was passed or what their retirement options are.

Mayor Guinta answered well the HR Director has been on vacation for the last two or two and a half weeks so that wasn't done. Again, with this particular issue I was notified by Tom Lolicata at the beginning I think of March that he was retiring so we had to act fairly quickly to make a proposal because you can't do it within the budget process. I couldn't make this proposal as part of my budget. It has to be something, by Charter, that is done outside of the budget. So it either had to wait or we had to get it out to the Committee, which was no necessarily my preferred method but the opportunity presented itself and I think as we move into the budget process and we are changing a lot of things in the budget process I thought it made far more sense to at least get this on the table in March so that the Committee would have several months to review it. In the future we will probably

look at doing this a little bit differently but the circumstances of this situation presented itself and I thought it just made sense with the opportunity of the retirement it makes the most sense at that point.

Alderman Roy stated there are a lot of parts of changing the City of Manchester that I agree with. I do have a problem of notification of employees and how some of that was taken care of and I do have concerns about when we start talking about eliminating positions and going to contracting and other things. I do think we need a change in our parking design and our enterprise and I definitely support getting the parking into an enterprise but there are a number of concerns as to a transition plan and timeframes that I have deep concerns over and whether this can be accomplished for the beginning of FY07.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would like to spend about another five or ten minutes with the Mayor. It is starting to get close to 7:45 PM and we have three other departments we want to talk to. I do not believe we are going to reach any conclusion tonight. We are going to have to have at least one more if not several more meetings on this so that we can bring back various presenters down the road but I would like to have at least a basic discussion with everyone this evening. If we could kind of wrap up questions for the Mayor I would appreciate it.

Mayor Guinta stated if I could just make one comment I would certainly...you know it seems like a year ago I presented my budget but it has only been a few days. I certainly had the opportunity to speak with a lot of Aldermen and department heads and members of the public and I certainly share some of the concerns that the Aldermen have talked about publicly and privately. This again is always a process and something that I am willing to try to make improvements on my side as we move forward. I am certainly willing to do it and I take that under advisement and it makes sense. Some of the things can be improved and again it is about making improvements all around, myself included, so I certainly appreciate the comment and will likely try to make some sort of accommodation for that.

Alderman Lopez stated there is so much in your budget. It is a drastic budget and there are so many different changes and so many decisions we will have to make. I think we have to know the law. I mean I served on the Charter Commission and consolidation is not supposed to be done within the budget. So Tom Arnold if you can't answer the question I think we need legal guidance as to the direction we are going in this particular area and in other areas of the budget. Have you and Tom Clark discussed any legalities and protection of the City Charter that we all hold an oath to uphold?

Deputy Solicitor Thomas Arnold stated in the specific context of parking control officers, no we have not, however we will certainly work with the Mayor to get that information.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think he is talking, Tom, about the bigger picture. He is talking the bigger picture of consolidation during the budget process.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I don't believe so at this point. I hesitate to speak for Tom.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we need a written report from the City Solicitor. I take the Charter very seriously as well as every other Alderman and I am sure the Mayor does too. I think the Charter is our guide and our bible to go by. I think we need to really have a legal opinion as to what we are doing because some of these things take time. I can remember when we talked about a consolidated Finance...everybody going into the Finance Department. It took months and the reports came back and disagreed with it and they said we ought to take a year and pick out two departments and see how it goes. I think you remember that, your Honor. That never happened. We were going to see if Finance could absorb...the City Clerk's Office volunteered and MEDO volunteered and it never happened. We have had many experts and department heads as advisors to whatever we do but I do hold the Charter very near to my heart because that is what we go by. It is not like you indicated in your opening remarks it is not personalities. We are all guided by rules and regulations and I just want to make sure that we are complying with the City Charter totally.

Mayor Guinta replied I would echo that sentiment and I did speak with Tom Clark during this process to make sure that we were adhering to the Charter requirements. He did assure me of a certain...for example now that the budget has been...I can't just include in my budget something and have it as part of my budget proposal. It has to have some sort of separate direction. That is why in March when I was notified by Mr. Lolicata of his retirement one of my first calls was to Tom Clark to ask him about the process and the procedure outlined in the Charter and he assured me that the direction we have to take by Charter is a separate process outside of the budget process, which is why it was important for me to put something together, make a recommendation and have the Board send it to this Committee. So from that perspective based on what Tom Clark has verbally told me we are adhering to the process. I would further echo your sentiment and I think getting something in writing from him to make sure as we go through this process that we do follow the process makes a lot of sense and I appreciate that concern.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a couple of questions. In your recommendation it is that the parking would become the responsibility of the Economic Development Director if I understood the letter from Randy?

Mayor Guinta responded Randy's letter...well the recommendation that came out of the parking consultant or one of the recommendations was that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen should assign responsibility for managing the transition of reorganization to one department. So my recommendation is that the transition of reorganization is assigned to the Economic Development Office. Again, I think that this Committee and this Board of Aldermen have to make sort of a recommendation about the long-term oversight. Where it should be and where it may end up could be two different areas and again I would voice my concern that as it exists today the Economic Development office in my opinion couldn't manage the parking enterprise for the long term.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Lopez reminded me that it is at least a \$6 million business – the parking.

Mayor Guinta replied it is and that is why I don't think as it exists today it could.

Chairman O'Neil asked so that point was just about a transition.

Mayor Guinta answered that is correct but I have and this is something that we will have to consider over time, certainly increased the expenses and the revenue from the Economic Development office because I do think that is a pretty clear and critical position for the City given the nature of the projects that I believe we are going to see based on the studies that we have paid for. This Committee is going to have to make a recommendation at some point and again it shouldn't be about me personally. It should be about either the Office of the Mayor or the Economic Development office. It shouldn't be about whether Frank Guinta should be doing this or whether Paul Borek should be doing it.

Chairman O'Neil stated if I look at your dollar savings summary the true changes per your recommendation are that we don't fill the Director position and it is eliminated and secondly that the Deputy Director's position is eliminated because there is wording that says both eliminate and phase out.

Mayor Guinta responded I am sorry. I have a copy that says phase out so I understand where the confusion came from. The dollar amount does represent one fiscal year.

Chairman O'Neil asked and then your recommendation would be the Administrative Services Manager moves with the enterprise parking system.



Mayor Guinta answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked and the decision about the...if it is decided not to contract out the painting then there is no additional cost to keep the one technician.

Mayor Guinta answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we wrap up with the Mayor because we have three other departments.

Alderman DeVries stated I would just ask the Mayor if he could also give us a little bit more detail on Item 4 on the savings summary and how you came to that number and maybe the breakdown of the enterprise dollars that you based your position on.

Alderman Shea asked could you tell me what you put in for the parking manager's salary.

Mayor Guinta answered I haven't identified that yet because that would have to be worked out with the HR Director and setting up guidelines but again it would be paid for by the enterprise so it wouldn't have a fiscal impact on the general fund.

Alderman Shea responded yes but you said the Mayor has budgeted for a parking manager within the FY07 budget.

Mayor Guinta replied well it would be part of the enterprise fund revenue so it would have to come out of that but it still needs to be determined at what level. I can't do that without the HR Director.

Alderman Shea stated and the other salary that you are moving someone over from Traffic to the enterprise have you...is there any salary there. Is that person...

Mayor Guinta interjected are you talking about the Administrative Services Manager.

Alderman Shea responded right.

Mayor Guinta stated again I need to go over that with the HR Director who is not available.

Alderman Shea asked so you have put money aside for them but you haven't put a specific amount.

Mayor Guinta answered well I moved their salaries over. For example, for the Administrative Services Manager that salary would be moved over.

Alderman Shea asked so that person's salary would be moved over but the parking garage manager, which you have indicated you budgeted for there is no specific amount.

Mayor Guinta answered right because that would come out of the revenue. If we are getting \$4 million in revenues today it would be \$4 million minus the cost of that individual. Again, I don't know if we would be hiring that at \$70,000 or \$80,000 or \$90,000.

Alderman Shea stated it could be any range.

Mayor Guinta responded it could be. Again, I think the HR Director...Alderman Lopez made a good point earlier. I think the HR Director needs to be here at a future meeting to give recommendations for the position and the guidelines of the position and theoretically what the pay would be for the position.

Chairman O'Neil stated thank you, your Honor, for your time. Why don't we bring up Finance – Kevin and Randy? Hopefully we can get through their portion quickly. We do have the consultant coming in and I understand it may not be the 17<sup>th</sup> based on conversations earlier.

Mr. Clougherty stated we have him coming in the 17<sup>th</sup> but whether he comes to a Committee meeting or not will be something else but he will be here and be accessible.

Chairman O'Neil responded it would be a shame if he doesn't meet...I think the intent was to have him meet with the Public Safety and Traffic Committee at some point. Randy or Kevin I think we have already kicked around some of the communications you have sent so I don't know if we need to revisit any specific items unless there is something you want to point out.

Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Director, stated the only thing I would like to say is I apologize for leaving the word transition out of Item 1. That was the intent was that the transition would be controlled by that one party. The only other couple of points and I was trying to take notes back there but unemployment is budgeted just under the Human Resources Department. It is not budgeted under every department. So within the HR budget and I believe in the past it has been roughly \$40,000 that has been budgeted out of HR so they take care of all of that. The issue with the PCO's...I have talked several times to Deputy Chief Simmons

over at Police and the issue is, you are correct, that there has to be a separation between those that issue the tickets and those that collect on the tickets. The individuals that collect on the tickets have access to information that would have to stay within the Police Department. So within the Mayor's budget the only thing that was moved from the Police budget to the parking enterprise fund were the PCO's themselves. The PCO's know that it is a red Toyota and a certain license plate. That is all they know. Once it goes over to the collection side now they know who owns it, where they live and do they have any other violations and all of those types of things. That is where the split is. So the collection part where you have Dale Robinson and the folks who work over in Ordinance Violations, they are staying within the general fund as part of the Police budget. The PCO's themselves need to move and the reason...

Chairman O'Neil interjected can I just stop you there. Can we get some documentation that shows...we have never been presented anything that says that because I would challenge them a little bit on that. The PCO's know when a car owner hasn't paid...they then call to boot the car.

Mr. Sherman responded right they know that there are outstanding violations on that but not necessarily outside the City I guess is what I was saying.

Chairman O'Neil replied I didn't mean to interrupt but if we could get documentation on that it would be helpful.

Mr. Sherman stated in talking to the parking consultant his issue is if you go into managed parking you need to manage the enforcement side because if they are trying to promote certain habits within the parking environment they need to have that enforcement. The parking manager needs to control the enforcement. Again, we will get you more information on that. I guess that is all unless Kevin, you have something.

Mr. Clougherty stated I think with respect to the enterprise, Alderman, you had asked what is the difference. The primary difference between an enterprise and the general fund operation is one is primarily supported by fees whereas the other is primarily supported by taxes. So the enterprise, for example, at Airport is fees at the Airport. Water is fees and in this case it would be fees for parking. That is the distinction.

Chairman O'Neil asked have you given any thought to the mechanics financially as to how this would all work. How we would transition if the votes are there to create the parking enterprise how we would transition from general operating budget to the enterprise? There has to be some...it just doesn't happen in one day. There has to be a transition to it.

Mr. Clougherty stated once a resolution is started and we would want it for the start of the fiscal year ideally if you are going to go that route but it really is just an allocation of dollars in the system so from the finance side and the accounting side it isn't terribly difficult. What gets more complicated as I think the Mayor said is the decisions you have to make about positions and how they are going to be funded and what is going to be included in the enterprise. The actual accounting and financial reporting is relatively quick for us as long as we have a couple of week's notice.

Chairman O'Neil asked did I hear you say that ideally you want to begin it at the start of the fiscal year but it is not the end of the world if it was four months into this fiscal year or six months into this fiscal year.

Mr. Sherman answered well the problem would be that you have to have an appropriation that would be for eight months here and four months there so you would want to have your appropriation start at the beginning of the year but as Kevin said as the dollars are collected and it doesn't matter who is collecting the dollars, whether we put it in the blue bucket and it stays in the general fund or you put it in the green bucket and it goes to the enterprise. That is fairly simple. That doesn't matter.

Mr. Clougherty stated the audit controls, too, are all set up and where we have established them before it is not that much of a problem for us.

Alderman Lopez stated maybe Kevin or Randy you guys could give us some information. We are talking about a \$6 million enterprise system and I know where you are going with capital improvement and all of that stuff. Does it hurt the general fund and how does it hurt the general fund because that \$6 million that we are getting now covers the parking aspect of it and we keep some of that money in the general fund – that goes back to the percentage and whether we should put 50% only in the enterprise and keep the revenue for our tax dollars in the general fund. I don't know if you can answer that tonight but maybe you can do a position paper on that.

Mr. Clougherty responded let me give you a quick answer because it sounds like we are going to be coming back to talk about this. The quick answer is right now you do have a certain operation that is making X dollars and a portion of that is going for expenses and the rest goes in the general fund. The concept of the enterprise is that if you do it different and you use more technology X is going to be X+ whereas what your operations are are probably going to be about the same. So there will be a net increase, as the Mayor explained, in the revenues that would be coming in to offset the taxes. So if you set it up properly and you see the

revenues enhance to the level that the consultant was recommending, you are going to get a net gain. That is a very simple answer to a complex question.

Alderman Lopez stated it is a complex question and I understand your answer but if you could put some type of position paper together...

Mr. Clougherty interjected showing what we are making now versus what the forecast might be.

Alderman Lopez stated right and how much we will be losing from the general fund if we put the \$6 million versus 50% because that \$3 million and I am just using that figure but that \$3 million that we keep in the general fund funds other things that we don't have to increase taxes for.

Mr. Clougherty stated remember his proposal is to take everything over the cost of the enterprise back into the general fund so you are not going to have a loss of revenue of \$3 million.

Alderman Lopez responded but we don't have any figures.

Mr. Clougherty stated so you want us to show that.

Alderman Lopez stated show us some numbers so that we can understand it. You two understand it but you have to make us understand it. I want to go back to this \$1 million and Mr. Arnold you can take us back to Tom Clark's...I still say that there were many times when both of you gentlemen said we couldn't fund operations out of the one time accounts.

Mr. Clougherty responded that is right.

Alderman Lopez stated you said that so many times and pounded it in our head so many times. Are you saying that we can do that now? Does it take 10 votes to do that?

Mr. Clougherty replied what you would be funding now, Alderman, is not operating costs. You would be funding capital. What you would be buying only with the dollars from the one time revenue account would be for the technology and the meters. That is a capital cost. It is not an operating cost.

Alderman Lopez stated we say that and what bothers me is that we talk about these meters and what do you call them, Smart Meters I guess where you put a meter on a corner and people have to walk a block and do all of that. Who's to say that Manchester, NH needs these types of meters? We don't have anybody

consulting us. You are financial people. We have people that come in to the Board...if you have somebody I haven't seen anybody in six years come before the Board and tell us that we need this other than financial people.

Mr. Clougherty responded the parking consultants are parking experts and they are not just financial. That was their recommendation and they said if you do invest in this capital, this new infrastructure for managing your parking that you will enhance your revenues. I think he said there would be a 30% increase.

Alderman Lopez stated well it is just an area that we will have to take a good look at before we have people in Manchester walking down the street a whole block to a parking meter.

Mr. Clougherty replied it is important, Alderman, that we understand...we have been consistent in our application of that rule. As you know we have jealously said this isn't...you know the one time revenue has to go to capital and more economic development types of things. In our opinion, this is a big investment in capital and it is for economic development purposes so if you choose to do this as a Board it certainly fits the guidelines. We don't see it as...we would not endorse using those dollars to go fund the operational or staff side of an enterprise.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to keep that in perspective and not prolong it but Tom Arnold if you can tell me whether or not we can use those funds and how many votes it takes in reference to the ordinance on the one time account I would appreciate it.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded absolutely.

Alderman DeVries stated the parking draft study had several recommendations for us and if I recollect the presentation before the full Board he talked about instituting a pilot program rather than a full blown...you know that it didn't have to cost us as much or the full kit and caboodle up front. That we could phase this in and start with a downtown designated pilot program. Is that something that you have abandoned now and you have decided that you don't want to...

Mr. Sherman interjected are you talking about the pay and display and the Smart Meters. We at one point had one of the manufacturers willing to come up and put in...I think he was going to put in like eight of the meters for us on his own dime. Come in and let us try it. That was before we did the parking study. The parking consultant has come back and said that would be literally a waste of your time to go through and do something like that. He feels that they are not maybe necessarily perfect for every location and in some places maybe you would keep some of the single heads that are out there. Even if you are going to keep single

head meters you would replace those with more technology themselves. He thinks that you would want to do an RFP for the entire downtown study area and what he is saying is the manufacturers will actually come in and decide here are the best places to put them and here is how they should be spaced out and here is how many of them you need rather than go through that study period. You would literally almost lose a whole additional year because if you don't do it now and get them in before the winter you have lost the winter. You literally have to...there are a couple of ways to do it but if you are putting them in the ground it is a 2' x 2' x 2' cube of cement that you drop in the ground. If you go down to New York they do put them on the lights and on the buildings. You can do them in other places. If you are getting down to the Millyard they would have to go in the ground and if you start getting into the winter then you have lost that season. What he is recommending is issue an RFP and let them come in and literally design it, tell you where they should go and how many there should be and then you can proceed with the process a lot faster. Now if you go through that RFP and you only want to implement 1/3 of it or 1/4 of it that certainly would be an option. You can say well okay we will only do the Elm Street area or just the Millyard area and try it and if we like it we can expand it.

Mr. Clougherty stated as we said we are bringing the consultant back up here on April 17 so we would certainly make him available to you so that you could have your questions answered directly by him. We don't want anybody to think that we are not representing his position. He is the expert. We have tried to summarize what we understand his position is but certainly that is why we are bringing him back so you can talk to him.

Alderman DeVries asked so you will be providing to us a full detail and I just heard Chairman O'Neil asking for the same thing – a full detail of the enterprise information that you gave to Mayor Guinta so that he could come up with some of the numbers that he provided to us.

Mr. Clougherty answered we could do a comparison.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess the final comment that I have and it is probably more for the rest of the Committee than it is for you but when I went through our BMA minutes or our agenda for tomorrow night I see items on there looking to change permit parking, residential permit parking and such. If you go back to the draft recommendations, part of the immediate recommendations they made to us for immediate implementation was to stop permit parking and put a moratorium on that. I just think we need to revisit that before we take action as a full Board tomorrow night and maybe ask the Traffic Department...I didn't hear that Committee meeting so I don't know the pieces of what went into that request for residential parking.

Chairman O'Neil responded I don't think it is all apples to apples. I think some of it...a street got missed at one point and I am drawing a blank but up on Amherst Street or something about residential parking. I don't think the changes that were recommended had anything to do with lots or garages. I am pretty sure they had...

Alderman DeVries interjected it says something about Elm and Pine and Amherst to...

Chairman O'Neil interjected we had created this zone and somehow Amherst Street had been excluded or something. I don't know if anybody at Traffic remembers that at all. That was one of the clean ups. I think we did refuse new permits in the Middle Street Lot last time because of exactly what you said.

Alderman DeVries stated it is not just permits for parking areas. They are also asking for a moratorium on residential until we get it in place. Maybe some of those recommendations could be highlighted and given to the members of the Traffic Committee to refresh their memory. That might be helpful.

Chairman O'Neil stated Deputy Clerk Normand just reminded me that it was to handle one building up behind the Library. That one item. It was just a housekeeping item.

Alderman Smith stated Alderman Shea asked about the enterprise and we all know that is a user fee and I want to know how many departments are in the enterprise right now.

Mr. Clougherty asked how many in the City are operating as enterprises.

Alderman Smith answered yes are enterprises.

Mr. Clougherty stated we have several enterprises. We have the Airport. We have Water and EPD. Parks has a part of it. I believe there are five.

Alderman Smith stated most of them supply a service like Water Works, EPD and so forth like that. I have somewhat of a concern because regardless of...if you are going into enterprise there is going to be a cost to the consumer no question about it. If you are looking for revenue the rates are going to be higher in the parking garage and higher in the parking meters. It is like a double tax, no question about it. What I am saying is the user is going to be paying so you can substantiate your revenue. I am definitely opposed to the Economic Development Director managing anything. I think he should take care of commercial and industrial uses and that is his job.



Alderman Shea stated if \$1 million were transferred do you visualize transferring any more money or is this a one time transferal because of the justification that you indicated for the expense of this rates and technology category kind of thing.

Mr. Sherman stated the idea of the enterprise fund is that it would generate sufficient revenues to take care of its own capital needs over the long haul so whether that be parking lot improvements or parking structures or more meters or whatever you want to have for parking control at Victory garage. Part of the parking consultant's recommendations when he said that we should sell the Center of NH garage and sell the Seal Tanning lot and sell the Granite Street lot is his idea is to provide the City with capital dollars so that it can enhance the parking program so that it can add to its inventory. If you take the equity that you have in the Center of NH garage and then roll that back into more parking it can help add to your inventory. Part of adding to your inventory is managing the supply that you already have. So by using that \$1 million out of the Center of NH fund that is all that is really doing. In the future it is all going to depend on whatever the parking manager comes in and puts together for a long range parking plan. If you are talking about parking structures or you are talking about again maybe there is more technology that needs to come in. I can't tell you if the \$1 million is the right number. That was a rough estimate. You have just shy of 3,000 meters out there. If you put in a new meter for every 10 spaces you are talking about 300 of them. I don't know. Are they \$5,000 or \$10,000? I don't know what the right number is but as a starting point he said that \$1 million probably is going to take care of the bulk of what you need if not all of it depending on how the bids come in. So to answer your question I guess we really don't know but again the intent of the enterprise fund is that it would be like Water or EPD. It wouldn't need to come back to the general fund. It would be self-sustaining going forward.

Alderman Shea stated the reason behind my question and maybe it is not related but maybe it is is that in the future if any executive or people in City government decide to initiate another enterprise for whatever reason is that kind of establishing a precedent here by saying well because we put so much money towards this rates and technology category maybe and I don't know I am just saying we could use anything from the Highway Department...whatever. If we decided we would make part of the Highway Department an enterprise would that mean then that money that we have set in one time accounts that we could use say \$2.5 million to set up that particular enterprise without necessarily doing anything contrary to what the Charter or anything indicates? That is what I am trying to...

Mr. Sherman interjected as long as it is of a capital nature you could.

Mr. Clougherty stated it is primarily for economic development.

Mr. Sherman stated if somebody said gee if you put windmills on the landfill that would help maybe that is something that you would want to entertain. Does it set a precedent? No I don't think so.

Alderman Shea stated it does to me because that is quite a bit of money and I really wasn't aware of it until it was brought up. I don't know how many other Aldermen were aware of it. I am not sure and I am expressing my ignorance but I don't know where it is in the budget to be honest with you. Where did the Mayor put this in the budget?

Mr. Sherman responded it is in the CIP budget.

Alderman Shea asked and did he label one item there in the CIP.

Mr. Sherman answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you lay out for a future meeting that we will have on what we will need to have in place, I guess it would have to be by the last Tuesday in June to allow us a phased in approach to the parking enterprise if the Board decides to go that route. I am not sure we are going to reach consensus before that and some of this may need some work during the year so what financial mechanisms would we have to have in place to allow that to go on if we haven't reached a conclusion on the entire thing? That is the first thing. The second item would be as I think this happens currently with existing enterprises you folks must have some chargeback number to provide financial services or Tom and Tom and their staff must have some number that they charge. I could be wrong on that but to the enterprises for some basic services. With this parking enterprise would Highway and maybe they do now be allowed to charge back for engineering services no matter whether Traffic remains a department or becomes a division. They would, I'm sure, be asked to provide some services like putting the posts up maybe or providing line painting in parking lots or in garages, etc. Are those items eligible for chargeback? How would that all work? I am not looking for an answer tonight. Is that allowable? Are we going to try to fit something in with the consultant coming in the April 17?

Mr. Sherman answered they have already purchased their airline tickets.

Chairman O'Neil stated well I am not really sure of the whole thing and why there is a conflict now on our side.

Mr. Clougherty stated we were told the 17<sup>th</sup> and that is what we were shooting for. We thought that was a good date and we made those arrangements. Then I guess there was a public hearing set for that date.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there is a road hearing scheduled at 5:30 that evening that will run until 7:30. There is a Finance Committee meeting scheduled after that to meet with the departments that have already agreed to be here at the request of the Finance Vice-Chair.

Mr. Sherman stated they have overlapped your Public Safety and Traffic meeting with a Finance Committee meeting. They already had their plans ready to come here. We were planning on having them meet with all of the Millyard owners on Tuesday so rather than cancel that we are going to have them come anyway. Maybe we can get a committee meeting on Tuesday night and squeeze something in there. If not, we will have to have them come back a second time.

Chairman O'Neil stated my concern is that we have to get our act together on this. This was committed awhile ago that they were coming up.

Mr. Sherman responded that was six weeks ago. I agree.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we are going to need a couple of hours with them anyway.

Mr. Clougherty stated maybe something like 4 PM we could do it. That makes a long day for the committee but we might be able to do something later in the afternoon after he has done what he is going to do and that might be productive.

Alderman Lopez stated I think in talking to the Finance Chair of the Board last week he has some ideas as to what he wants to do before the Committee makes any type of decision. If this individual is already coming you might make him available, if you can't get a Committee to listen to what he has to say, for the Aldermen to come in and question him.

Mr. Clougherty responded that is fine Alderman. Whatever is convenient for you is fine with us.

Chairman O'Neil stated personally as a member of the Public Safety and Traffic Committee that is where I expected him to appear. That was the intent.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I do have the whole schedule in front of me because I thought this item might come up tonight so I thought I would come up somewhat prepared. On Tuesday evening, the 18<sup>th</sup>, which is the following day, the

same day that they are meeting with all of the private people there are two committee meetings scheduled at 5:15 PM and 5:30 PM. One of which is Public Safety and Traffic. The other I am sure we could move and take care of at another time. So in reality on Tuesday before the Board meeting the Chairman of Public Safety and Traffic could hold that meeting that was intended to be held on Monday night on Tuesday night. It was my understanding from the Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee that he wanted to get some of the other financial stuff out and understood because some of that would obviously tie in with the discussion with the consultant as well. From my understanding he felt that there was a lot to do and we needed to get the departments in and get some of that information out first. That was a priority on his part. We might be able to accommodate it on Tuesday.

Mr. Clougherty stated well you know he is coming and we will make him available whatever the forum. That was the intent to have him speak to you people so whatever is convenient for you we will make arrangements.

Chairman O'Neil called the Highway Department forward. Is there anything you would like to highlight Frank? I know you sent a letter that reviewed the 2002 proposal and how it changed today.

Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, stated I would just like to restate some of the things in this memo. The way I envisioned the Mayor's proposal with the creation of the enterprise fund it would basically leave two sections of the traffic operation, that being the signal section and the painting sign section, which we would propose to incorporate into the Highway operation under the leadership of our Chief of Highway Operations. So two crews would be created – a signal crew and the line sign crew. As noted administrative functions would be accomplished by our existing Highway administrative staff. That would be payroll, bill paying, etc. The signal section...I know there was a question regarding the number of signal technicians. In 2002 when we did our original consolidation proposal for Mayor Baines there were two signal positions. At that time we recommended that staffing in that area should be increased to three. In reviewing their structure right now I noticed that there were three signal technicians so I did call Virginia Lamberton in the HR Department and she kind of indicated that there is a little confusion over the exact number of approved signal technicians. She indicated to me that one position was brought on as I would classify it as a transitional position because there was a signal technician that was gravely ill with the likelihood that he wasn't going to be coming back to work and as such there was some kind of authorization given to bring on that third position in a transitional role. The signal technician that was gravely ill did make a recovery and is still working for the City. However, again our proposal back in 2002 recommended three signal technicians because of the fact that the City is growing and that whole area is

getting more complicated and I guess the Mayor in his proposal built on our recommendation and is recommending the three signal technician positions. I, quite frankly, recommended in 2002 that somewhere down the line those signal technician positions should be reevaluated by HR because I thought there may be a need for an update of those positions because of the technical nature of the services they provide and the fact that there is a market for them out in the public sector. That would be a crew that would be shift into Highway. The second crew would be the sign striping section. Again, it would be shifted over – the crew. In the Mayor's proposal he recommended either putting out an annual painting contract and the elimination of one maintenance worker or keeping the maintenance worker and utilizing the equipment that is there now. Quite frankly, my recommendation would be maybe a combination of both. I think there would be some benefit to putting out an annual striping/painting contract for a couple of reasons. Number one, the painting truck that they have right now is about 18 years old but is still in pretty good condition. If you could reduce the amount of work that that truck had to perform every year I think we could prolong the life of it so that we could still maintain in-house some line painting capabilities after we resurface a roadway, etc. So again what we would envision are those two crews under the Mayor's proposal being folded into Highway and we would assume the administrative duties. What would be left would be the record keeping, the issuing of ordinances, signage and parking restrictions and whatnot. In my correspondence I noted that to me this is a very important function of the traffic operation and we wouldn't want to see any delays that might result from any type of restructuring or whatnot. Initially, those duties for record keeping and assigning ordinances, etc. would be done by a combination of myself, my Deputy, my Administrative Services Manager, people in engineering and people in the field forces until we got a clear understanding of the complexity of that work task and until we were able to develop some operational procedures, standards and whatnot to be followed and then we would assign a single point of contact to initiate and follow those tasks through. Speaking of the traffic engineer position that I feel strongly for, I look at a consolidation or restructuring not only to save money and to maybe generate revenues and those type of things but to improve the overall efficiencies and capabilities of an organization. Right now a traffic engineer for the size of Manchester, I think, is needed. We have issues with traffic calming. We have issues with speed. We have issues with wanting to look at improving the flow of traffic through intersections. We do presently pay if we utilize Southern NH Planning to do some traffic counts and studies for us but again there could be a lot more that we could do on a more rapid basis if we had a traffic engineer on board. In addition, through the Planning process we are constantly asking developers to submit traffic studies. Granted people in Planning have the ability to read and understand them and the same with our department but again it makes sense that if you are requiring traffic studies to be submitted as part of the development process it would be nice to have a qualified traffic engineer to

review those traffic studies and deal on a one-to-one basis traffic engineer to traffic engineer. Again, that is the reason why in my proposal of 2002 I recommended that ultimately a traffic engineer be brought on and be a benefit to the City. Having said that, I will be glad to try to answer any of your questions.

Alderman Lopez stated you sent us a letter and I want to go through a couple of things here to make sure that we have the complete record here. You mentioned a traffic engineer that you are for, which would be about \$66,000. That doesn't include benefits or anything is that correct?

Mr. Thomas responded that does include benefits. I believe I used like 33%.

Alderman Lopez asked could you elaborate just a little bit more on the paragraph "I have no desire in taking over another department where it has been made perfectly clear that no one in the consolidating department will financially benefit from a consolidation."

Mr. Thomas answered well that is a position that I think I publicly at this desk stated to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in the past when consolidation was being looked at. I do not have any desire to take on any additional departments. I have a lot on my plate right now. It seems like every time something comes up that no one else wants to get, I wind up getting it, which is fine. That is my duty and I will do what I am directed to do. Also, it has been made very, very clear that a consolidating department will not benefit by the consolidation and I read that to mean that if I take on more duties or if myself or my staff take on more duties or responsibilities there will not be any additional compensation to go along with it. Again, I guess I would ask the question would anybody in this room want to take on more duties and responsibilities without receiving any benefit from it.

Alderman Lopez responded I think we will have to ask the HR Director because we do have ordinances as you are well aware of because you were on the Yarger Decker Committee. There is a point system and you might be at a higher point where we would be in violation of the ordinance in reference to compensation for a City employee so that will wait for another day.

Mr. Thomas stated again I also want to make it clear that in my letter I did state that even though I have some reservations about taking on additional duties and responsibilities I have never shirked my duties. If the Board of Mayor and Aldermen have directed me to do something I will do it to the best of my ability.

Alderman Lopez stated I was joking with your earlier in the evening and I said every time...there are nine consolidations that Frank Thomas has been involved with since 1992. It seems like everything that comes up Frank Thomas gets it and

you are commended for the work that you do. I am just wondering if maybe we should offer you a City Manager job to run the City. On a serious note, I was wondering and this is not a derogatory remark but to make sure that we have an understanding and see when we talk about consolidation, could your Building Maintenance Department...just give us one or two sheets of back when they were made a division of your department and the type of people you have there. We were going to save \$34,000. What is the total salary today and I understand the difference in hiring technicians but could you give us the savings that the City received – some type of savings that when we took the Building Maintenance Department and made it a division of the Highway Department you had X number of people and we were going to save \$34,000, what it is today and what we accomplished in that period of time?

Mr. Thomas stated when we made the original proposal for the consolidation and restructuring of Public Building Services into the Highway Department as the Facilities Division yes we were able to demonstrate by not filling the then Director's position and making some minor modifications in salaries that there was a savings of approximately \$33,000 or \$34,000. Now as I said earlier in my presentation, I view a consolidation not only to save money but to improve the overall operation and function of that area. Now the Facilities operation, as you know, has been expanded through restructuring and additions. We now have the capabilities in that division not only to do maintenance, which was the original intent of Public Building Services, but to oversee capital construction projects. That Facilities Division, I believe, has earned its money over and over again just in one area alone –the School design-build project. The Facilities Engineer that we brought on, if we were to contract out the services that he provided in developing the performance specifications and putting the package together for that \$100 million design project you would be talking a sizable amount of expenditure of funds. So again I see that where we were when that operation was Public Building Services and where we are right now like night and day. We have a custodial operation that is very smooth. I believe the School District is very happy with it. We had some early problems that have been resolved. We have preventive maintenance that is now being done through that division that, quite frankly, was never done before. Until we took over that operation there were filters in HVAC systems in the schools that were never changed. So here we are. We have cleaner schools. We have better maintained equipment and now we have a whole different side that is responsible for capital construction on facilities in the City. Ultimately this capital side is going to be able to standardize equipment so that when a building is built it can have similar type of mechanical systems that are in the building across the street, which ultimately again is going to save money. That operation has evolved and expanded but quite frankly to the benefit of the City I believe.

Alderman Lopez stated I know that in 1999 when it was going into the Highway Department we were going to save \$34,000 but by doing this and adding this and adding this I want to know this is what the budget is today for that division but if we did not do this it would have cost...I don't know if you can figure out some type of dollar figure if we did not have that structure today what it would cost.

Mr. Thomas responded we will try to address your request but keep in mind I don't know how you quantify not changing filters in HVAC systems and now changing them at the recommended schedule. There is a cost connected to that but it is a cost that benefits our students and the air that they are breathing. I can give you some of that information like what we had for staffing and what the operating budget was and what we have for staffing now and the operating budget.

Alderman Forest stated Frank you talked about absorbing some of the duties of the Traffic Department – the signs and electricians and all of that. One of the comments you made was about permits and ordinances that you and your staff could do but it would be...I don't want to put words in your mouth but trial and error.

Mr. Thomas responded no quite frankly it is not brain surgery. It is just that there is a record keeping system that is over at Traffic that we are not familiar with and we want to make sure that we do not cause delays because I know that is an area that is important not only for the Board of Mayor and Aldermen but for the safety of the residents of Manchester. We want to make sure that we put enough assets into addressing that area properly and not by trial and error but through engineering...if necessary I can have an engineer go out and take a look at where Alderman Forest would like to have a street posted no parking to make sure it makes sense and does conform to all of the requirements. I have people like my Chief of Highway Operations who is out on the road and we have inspectors that are on the road. Again, if a request comes in we want to make sure that we have staff available. I mean we don't have staff sitting now with our feet up on our desk. We are all busy but we know that that is an additional function that we are going to have to take on and we want to make sure we can address it properly.

Alderman Forest stated again I am going to go back to what I said earlier and I know I can't put...I don't want to say blame but I don't want to put it on your shoulders because it really wasn't your idea. I have no problem with attrition or job freezes or anything else. I do have a problem with senior staff that have 30 or 35 years on the job. I know that this person and other people are intelligent enough that they are not going to spend 50 years working for the City. So if the Deputy Director is intelligent enough he will only be here a couple of more years and I would really hate to see that position...creating another position is fine but I



really hate to see that position eliminated this far in a person's career. Again I know it is not your idea but that is my comment.

Alderman DeVries stated the subcontracting or contracting out of line painting in the Mayor's proposal I think he was using a \$53,000 figure. In your 2002 proposal you had grabbed a \$47,000 figure. Is that something that you rechecked and provided him with that updated number?

Mr. Thomas responded no I haven't. In 2002 when I prepared my proposal I talked to George Cromby who was at the time the Public Works Director down in Nashua and he had just told me that he had just contracted for a million linear feet of street painting or striping for a price of \$47,000. No, I have not checked that. Again, I would recommend a combination. I would recommend an annual program at some level of funding to do striping in order to preserve the equipment that we have and by preserving the equipment we have we can still retain the flexibility of being able to use that equipment when we resurface a road and need to restripe the road.

Alderman DeVries stated yes I did hear you make that comment earlier that you didn't think that we needed to totally sacrifice the in house line painting. I would like to have an updated number because if there is one thing that we have seen or I have seen in the City is that we do get initial low bids and then a few years down the line once you have sold your equipment...I think our janitorial contract maybe has presented some issues as it seems to get more and more expensive and every time you try to do something different within the contract it costs the City more money. I just don't want to see us repeating what in my view was a past mistake. I would like some updated numbers to know that in 2002 for Nashua it was \$47,000 but tell me what they are paying today and tell me some other cities and what they are doing.

Mr. Thomas replied I could do that but again this represented 1 million linear feet. I have no idea how many linear feet the Traffic Department paints annually so to give you an exact figure...if we could somehow attain that figure then I could call around.

Alderman DeVries stated to compare apples to apples 1 million linear feet is fine. That is absolutely fine. Within the 2002 proposal you talked about on the very bottom of Page 2 and I don't know how well you remember this but you were trying I think there to compare the parking management contract at the time. Even back in 2002 you identified one of the key parts of the proposal as increasing parking fees. I think you did that in the fourth line up from the bottom saying that the increase in parking fees was justified in order to cover the increased parking management contract at that point. I guess my point is that we have known for

decades that we have been supplementing a cost and the potential revenues by keeping the cost of parking in the City down as an economic development tool. I am just not sure that all of the business owners downtown on Elm Street are ready to say that we don't need to continue to somehow supplement those fees to make sure that our businesses are strong downtown. It is not really a question but more of a statement I realize.

Mr. Thomas stated I think I would like to go back to what is in my report of 2002 and I do remember the write up. In the proposal in 2002 I was recommending that if the City brought on a new parking management consultant that they could potentially take over the collection of meter revenues and whatnot and by assigning them an additional duty and responsibility over and above what the management contracts were covering at the time that increase could be justified by a slight increase in parking fees. But you are right. I think anything that you pass on to a parking manager or an enterprise fund would have to be paid for out of those fees that you generate. I was just showing back in 2002 if you did something along that line there was a mechanism where we could recoup those additional costs.

Alderman DeVries responded the key operative in what you just said was slight increase because slight increase probably isn't as offensive as major increases to make it pay its own way. Thank you.

Alderman Shea stated I know that when somebody is first elected Alderman somebody says get ready because you are going to get a lot of calls and we certainly do as Alderman. As an Alderman, Frank, I have called the Traffic Department I can't tell you how many times. I reviewed six papers that I keep of notes and there were 56 times so I am not sure whether the same type of service is even possible from transferring the responsibilities but I leave that as a comment. When the people are transferred over from the Traffic Department to Highway and there are specific kinds of things that are involved with signalization who in the Highway Department at this time is knowledgeable to present either work schedule for these people or how can that be set up in your judgement?

Mr. Thomas replied as far as scheduling work and whatnot, we have 72 different activities that we perform at one time or another in the Highway Department on a regular basis. We could have crews building roads. We could have crews paving streets. So scheduling work for the signal section or line painting section I don't foresee as being a difficult thing.

Alderman Shea asked well would the person who is handling these responsibilities be knowledgeable in this area because of their training as far as being a master technician or someone who is qualified to say to these people who are going to be

subject to that person well this is what you have to do or if somebody has a problem who do they turn to because Tom Lolicata has been around and the Deputy is not according to this consolidation going to be around. Who do they turn to? Someone in your department who is skilled enough to be able to do this?

Mr. Thomas responded if you are asking if we have any licensed electricians that work in the Highway Department no. We do have licensed electricians that work in our Facilities Division that we could call on. Do they have the expertise in traffic controllers? No but again I think the one or two times that we may run into a difficulty if we need to we would go to the private sector and get some advice if necessary.

Alderman Shea asked so who in the Highway Department would you transfer this responsibility to. You mentioned...I know that you can't handle this. You said the man in charge of the Highway, who would that be?

Mr. Thomas answered all field operations fall under the Chief of Highway Operations and that is Steve Tierney.

Alderman Shea asked so Steve Tierney would handle that.

Mr. Thomas answered that is correct. It would be another crew just like our curb crew, our sidewalk crew, our street sweeping crew, our paving crew, etc. I can go down the list.

Alderman Shea asked now it was brought up this evening that there is the strong possibility that the parking meter operation cannot be transferred to the enterprise and the Mayor indicated that well it could go back to Traffic which he is obviously consolidating with Highway. Now that is \$141,533. Would you be able to handle that amount of money in your present budget allocation in FY07?

Mr. Thomas responded I don't know what that number represents quite frankly.

Alderman Shea replied that number represents the people now that would be reassigned from parking meters to the enterprise - \$141,533 and he indicated that...I guess he came back when Randy was speaking and said you are right that these people can't go into an enterprise so if they were to go to your department can you absorb these people.

Mr. Thomas responded I thought I heard that they could because of the segregation of the duties between the violation section and...

Chairman O'Neil interjected if I may I think the discussion at the time was around parking control officers, not...is that what you are talking about parking control. Those wouldn't be out of the Traffic Department anyway. Those are currently out of the Police Department. The savings here is from the parking meter technicians and collection people correct?

Mr. Thomas answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated and I think the reference to it could not be done was regarding Ordinance Violations.

Mr. Thomas stated I believe that was the case that is correct.

Alderman Forest stated if I understand the note that I have here, that would be revenue not...that \$141,533 number which is Item 4 on the summary we got...

Chairman O'Neil interjected no it is some cost and I don't know exactly what it is attributed to. I interpreted that as...I think there are two meter technicians who maintain and install the meters.

Mr. Thomas stated that is correct. What is noted in the Mayor's proposal for \$141,533 is the three parking meter technicians that presently exist in the Traffic operation. One of those positions is presently vacant but there are three positions and what they do is install meters, repair meters and collect the money out of the meters. It is my understanding that those three positions in some fashion would be shifted over to the enterprise fund operation.

Alderman Shea asked if that is the case then you wouldn't have to absorb that expense thing.

Mr. Thomas answered no because they would be in the Enterprise fund and that is why I said earlier it is my understanding from the Mayor's proposal that it would be just the signal crew and the line and sign painters that would be incorporated into Highway.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to clarify something to make sure that I understand what you are saying. If the parking became part of your division I think Alderman Shea was saying...I know what was said before but let's say it became part of the Highway Department, the parking aspect of it. I think where the confusion...the Mayor did not put in the budget and Finance is here and they can clarify it but for the parking control officers the money is not there in the Police Department's budget thereby coming out of the enterprise. The question

that Alderman Shea was getting at was if you absorb all of this is there enough money in your budget to take care of those parking control officers?

Mr. Thomas responded no because again those funds were taken out of the Police Department and put into the enterprise fund. What was being talked about was the \$141,533 for the three meter technicians that are now in Traffic. We could take back those three meter positions somehow in the department but if you are looking to incorporate the other three positions – the enforcement positions then there would have to be additional funds that went along with what is in the enterprise fund.

Alderman Lopez stated so we would put all of the money back into the general fund if we didn't go to an enterprise system and we would have to add money to your department in order to...

Mr. Thomas interjected yes but I guess what I don't understand is if all of those functions came into the Highway Department why wouldn't you leave the enforcement people under Police.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that is a good question that we need to find out. I think the parking control officers could work with parking management but the enforcement would have to stay with Police. I think that is what Alderman Forest said.

Chairman O'Neil responded no the Ordinance Violations would have to stay. The collection of the money would have to stay with the Police Department. The enforcement end could go under parking.

Alderman Lopez stated the big problem is that we all have vocal chords but we don't have anything in writing. I am confused as to whether we have four technicians or three technicians or one is sick and nobody knows.

Alderman Smith asked how many signal technicians do we have. I heard two tonight. I have heard three.

Chairman O'Neil stated I heard four.

Mr. Thomas stated I can only go by what I got for an answer from Virginia Lamberton of HR. Again, when I was reviewing and updating my 2002 proposal for the Mayor I noticed back in 2002 there were two approved signal technician positions. Virginia Lamberton quoted to me over the phone but I would suggest that you get her in here in front of your Committee, she indicated that special permission was granted to fill the third signal technician position in like a

transitional capacity while the person or the signal technician that was gravely ill was out with the likelihood of never coming back. Again as I mentioned it is my understanding that there was a recovery that was made and there are three positions that are on the books presently. One of them is somewhat questionable. Again under my proposal of 2002 and under the Mayor's proposal that question has been clarified and I guess we both are recommending that three positions be created forever and ever.

Alderman Smith stated that is enough from Frank. I would like to have Jim Hoben come up from the Traffic Department because he can answer all of these questions I believe.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a couple of questions for Frank.

Alderman Shea stated I was just going to comment that there are two people physically working in the Traffic Division. One man who was sick and came back to work and is back out sick again.

Mr. Thomas responded again as far as positions that have been budgeted for...if you take a look at the...

Chairman O'Neil interjected is authorized the right word maybe or is that questionable.

Mr. Thomas stated it is questionable whether the third position was authorized, however, when the request for the complement of Traffic in the FY07 budget, three signal technicians were requested and funds were requested for three signal positions and no matter what happens I would like to think that there will be three signal technicians approved for the Traffic Division or Traffic operation because I think they are needed.

Alderman Shea stated if I can continue #7 says keep three signal technicians at no cost. That is what is listed. Well if there is no cost are they working for nothing?

Mr. Thomas responded no. Again, three traffic signal technicians have been identified in the complement and their salary has been budgeted for at least in the request.

Alderman Shea asked in your budget.

Mr. Thomas answered no in the Traffic Department's request.

Alderman Shea stated well the Traffic Department request has that been put into actualization or is that going to be eliminated – the Traffic Department.

Mr. Thomas responded we all made requests to the Mayor as part of our budget process and as part of the budget process the Traffic Department requested and programmed salaries for three signal technicians. Now whether they are funded or not in the next budget is up to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Again, I think there is some clarification that needs to be given to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen from HR regarding exactly what the approved number of signal technicians is.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a few items. Right now regarding the traffic engineer's position it is currently being done between three departments correct? Your department, the Traffic Department and somewhat the Planning Department?

Mr. Thomas replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there any liability to the City not having a traffic engineer.

Mr. Thomas answered only if we screw up somewhere. Does the City of Manchester by law have to have an engineer? No I don't think there is a law that states that. Again, I think when you add up the fact that we now contract for some of those services and we now have to request an outside party for some of those services and that some of the services of a traffic engineer just aren't done because we don't have those services...

Chairman O'Neil interjected could we possibly get and I don't know if you have this but what you may have paid a consultant for services that if you had a traffic engineer it could have been reviewed in house, what you are paying Southern NH Planning if anything and they may be providing it as part of a fee...

Mr. Thomas interjected I believe they do it as part of a fee.

Chairman O'Neil stated and then I don't know how much time from Traffic or from the Planning Department is associated with this. I would guess anything that came up on the City side would be approved by a professional engineer. Any drawings that went out would be approved by a professional engineer within City staff.

Mr. Thomas responded right.

Chairman O'Neil stated I am aware of a major lawsuit and this doesn't have to do with a municipality but it is over a traffic intersection issue. There is a significant lawsuit going on because of the fatalities.

Mr. Thomas responded I think I know that one.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is a serious item that needs consideration.

Mr. Thomas replied but again as I keep mentioning I look at a consolidation as to try to improve the services that you are trying to provide. For example, Bridge Street. There has been some discussion regarding speed and safety. Quite frankly some of the recommendations that staff talked about have been put on hold until traffic studies can be done by Southern NH Planning. If there was somebody on staff that could do that it could be done a lot faster. There is a lot of talk and concerns raised regarding speed on our one-way streets. Again, I think if you had a traffic engineer on staff some of those issues could be addressed. We looked at traffic calming measures on Jobin Drive. We went out and hired a consulting firm or basically a traffic engineer to make recommendations on traffic calming measures. Again, I think a traffic engineer could do that.

Chairman O'Neil stated my point is we may already be paying for that service.

Mr. Thomas responded part of it yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated regarding if there was a consolidation of the Traffic Department to Public Works and I am not talking about the parking portion but traffic signals and the sign painting group. Do you see it being run similar to how you run the Facilities Division of Public works?

Mr. Thomas replied no it wouldn't be a separate division. It would be separate crews under our Highway Division or Highway section.

Chairman O'Neil asked could it be a division.

Mr. Thomas answered I don't really think there is a need for it to be a division at least if you take away all of the parking functions.

Chairman O'Neil asked and employees within the Facilities Division are they allowed to go for other jobs that would be considered a promotion within Public Works.

Mr. Thomas answered once they are incorporated into the Highway Division yes they could post for whatever positions become available.



Chairman O'Neil asked so somebody who might be an electrician in the Facilities Division if there was a position that paid a higher grade at EPD they could apply for that position and be given consideration for that position.

Mr. Thomas answered yes they could do that now. Typically you post in house now and then you post to the rest of the departments.

Chairman O'Neil stated you noted a couple of times in communications reimbursement by the state for some line painting.

Mr. Thomas responded well if you are doing any painting on state routed roads you can get a reimbursement for that painting.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we know if that currently happens.

Mr. Thomas answered I don't know if the City gets anything.

Alderman Lopez asked just to clear up anything the Traffic Department was part of the Highway Department at one time and it went its separate way and now we want to put it back. Comments?

Mr. Thomas answered I wasn't around when they left the Highway Department.

Alderman Lopez stated it was in 1969. Regarding the traffic engineer, have you researched the traffic engineer in Nashua because I think they have two of them?

Mr. Thomas responded I don't know.

Alderman Lopez asked so you haven't researched that. That would be a question for Jim Hoben.

Alderman Shea stated one of the things that mystifies me is that if a traffic engineer is so important why does it take consolidation to hire one. Why don't you put in for one if it is so important Frank or why haven't you put in for one? If it is such an integral part of how we run the City...my concern is does it need a consolidation proposal in order for a traffic engineer to be hired?

Mr. Thomas replied first of all the position I think that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen has taken over the last few years is that they frowned on bringing on any new positions. Again, in my proposal of 2002 I said if you phased out certain positions and you realized those savings some of those savings could be directed to bringing on a traffic engineer. Again, you can bring on a traffic engineer for

\$66,000 or \$70,000 with benefit where you are talking about a Traffic Director for \$109,000 salary.

Alderman Shea stated well we don't set your budget. You set it yourself and then the Mayor comes along and he makes a budget and then we either approve his budget or we do other things to it. I have never known how significant a traffic engineer was in terms of the City's operation until you begun to elaborate upon that. Now when you appeared before the Aldermanic Board have you indicated to us at any time other than through your budget how important a traffic engineer would be to the City? I don't recall you doing it.

Mr. Thomas stated well quite frankly I think the traffic engineer position should have been requested by the Traffic Department or the Planning Department, not the Highway Department. That is why I never requested it. The positions that are important to the Highway Department and the duties and responsibilities under the Highway Department and Facilities Division and I have asked for positions and gotten some and not gotten others. Again, I think a traffic engineer should have been requested by the Traffic Department or the Planning Department.

Alderman Shea stated rather than through your department but since there is consolidation now you reason that it would be significant for your department to have a traffic engineer because of the added responsibilities that your department is assuming if they were to take over the Traffic Department.

Mr. Thomas responded again what I go back to, which I have said on numerous occasions is that I believe consolidation should improve the benefits or performance of what you are taking on. Again, I think a traffic engineer would be a benefit. Is it crucial to the City? No. The City has gone many, many years without a traffic engineer.

Chairman O'Neil called Jim Hoben and Denise Boutillier forward. I don't know if there are any items that you want to review in your communication of the 29<sup>th</sup> or if you just want to go to questions.

Jim Hoben, Deputy Traffic Director, stated first of all I would just like to say that the Guinta plan or Mayor Guinta's plan shortchanges traffic signals because you are getting rid of...right now we have two signal technicians and one is out. Now you are taking me out of the picture. There is no transition plan. I don't see any traffic operations experience at the Highway so who is going to run the show. Frank said that there is no experience in the operations or management of ordinance records. You are looking at her and I who have been doing it for...I have been doing it for 18 years and she has been doing it for 15 years. Quite frankly who is going to do it? I am looking at all of this other stuff. There is a lot

of misinformation. You keep talking about the traffic paint truck and a \$200,000 savings. If you looked at the paint truck, we changed the chassis on that truck 10 years ago and what you can do is take the stuff and swap it to the new truck. All of your back tanks are 10 years old. So there is a savings there. You don't just throw the whole truck out. The state traffic bureau does the same thing. They keep the tanks but just move them to a new truck. Kevin Buckley is looking at this right now as part of his audit. I gave him all of the company names to call to get real figures. I gave him the Traffic Bureau contacts up there to find out what the trucks cost, the size of the trucks...I think Highway was basing it on 300 gallon tanks. We use 110 gallons. So in the size of the truck there is a big discrepancy. There are some other things. There is no transition period. The transition isn't laid out so how does it happen? Just overnight. Do people take over when there is no experience? It makes no sense. Some of the other things. When you are talking about liability for a traffic engineer all of our signals are state approved that I send in and they mark them off as to the operation and plans of the signals. They approve them up there – Bill Lambert who is a traffic engineer. That way you are covered by liability. That is state law. Some of the other things that...if I look back I think Alderman Forest was there in 1990 at the Police Department. Do you remember what happened down on South Willow Street when all of the signals went out and the state didn't respond?

Alderman Forest stated that I remember but I wasn't on the department at that time.

Mr. Hoben stated the Police had to stay there all day and there were multiple accidents. The state wouldn't respond. We didn't have the same equipment then. We couldn't help them out but they weren't responding because they have one guy to cover the state. So there were multiple accidents and the Police Department was up in arms and they said that it was going to effect their budget because of all of the overtime for the policemen. If you start playing with traffic safety that is the kind of stuff that happens. Some of the other things. Right now we have two signal technicians and one traffic signal supervisor, who is a working technician. That is our complement. All of the things here are so technical that when there is no one around or the boss doesn't know the technicalities of these controllers how is he going to help the guy in the field who is stuck? We have one guy out now and one guy with one year of experience. It takes at least 3-5 years to learn on the job. You can't hire these guys off the street. It is on-the-job training. If you look back at Nashua, they have two traffic engineers and a traffic operations manager. Now they have 88 signals and we have 128 plus another 23 that we do maintenance on. There are swinging doors in Nashua. Four traffic engineers have left in five years so there is no longevity there. They just keep coming and going. I don't know what else I can tell you. I think it is a detriment to the City. The parking operations is a whole other ball game. We took that over in 1992. It was

thrown upon us after the parking manager was let go. So her and I and Tom have been winging it besides doing the other traffic operations. Now you come in and say well gee it was okay then but now it is not okay. It just doesn't make any sense. Again, there is no transition. It should all be written out step by step by step what is going to happen. You have 3,400 permits out there. All of the sudden you are just going to flip that and say who is going to do it. She doesn't know if she is going to be here? So then who is going to do it. It has to be figured out. We came up with a plan to throw one in because we didn't know what was going to happen. There are some good ideas there. The new parking manager can take them and run with them. We couldn't sit back and do nothing.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't know if Denise has a microphone but I think your comments, Jim, are very important. As to what we can do in the meantime you bring up some very good points. If you could comment on the proposal that you submitted to us but before I give you an opportunity to do that I wanted to ask Denise a question in reference to this. I know that you have been doing the parking and you run a great and efficient operation over there for what you have. I also know that over a number of years be it whether the Board of Aldermen or a Committee or a past department head restricted you. I noticed some things in your proposal. I guess the basic question I want to ask you Denise is could you be a parking manager for the entire City? You are doing it now to a degree and you have heard some of the comments from other people in this room. Is that a job that you could do?

Denise Boutillier, Administrative Services Manager, responded I would be willing to learn whatever it is that is missing.

Alderman Lopez stated tell us what you do please. I think it is important.

Ms. Boutillier responded right now we have about 3,500 parking permits that are issued to about 400 or 350 to 400 different customers. We implemented the parking permit system probably about 12 years ago. Back then there were probably about 100 permits being issued to different agencies or maybe a few more. We now have about 3,5000. So that whole system is handled by our department. Jim and I, mostly myself but Jim has sort of been my back up. We handle that whole system and it is a cumbersome and very complicated parking system but we have been handling it. To turn it over to someone who isn't familiar with it and reinvent a parking system is going to cause complete chaos in the City number one. Their intention is to pull back the parking permits and reissue them. Once you pull back all of the parking permits you have people parking everywhere. What is the plan to implement a new parking system? So we handle that. We also handle all of the parking garages. The Victory garage employees and all of the budgeting that has to do with all of the parking system.

We handle all of the parking meter procedures. The collections, the monitoring and the security of all of the parking collections. I am sure there is more I am just on the spot so...

Alderman Lopez interjected I guess in looking at if we went to a parking enterprise you probably could do more. Jim, your recommendation here if we go to the last page if the Board gave you authority to implement some of the changes that you recommended here like putting meters in the Victory parking garage and stuff like that I am looking at figure of \$159,000 that you could save just like that. Am I reading that right?

Mr. Hoben responded that is with the revenues also.

Alderman Lopez stated right net savings and net increase revenue of \$159,000 if the Board or Traffic Committee would allow you to do that. Can you just elaborate on why some of these things...they seem like common sense to me but why some of these things were not done?

Mr. Hoben responded we had a management contract in the garages. It is the same company that also handled the Canal Street garage. Now we are down to one garage and that is Victory. We have had some problems. There have been some chargebacks that weren't supposed to be there more than once and we had Kevin Buckley look at it and he found where they were. We don't have control of the garage. We have an outsider. So our thought was why spend all of this money on...have inventory control come in and set up ticket spitters and make it simple. You can hire the four guys that are there, increase your security in the garage by stretching it out and having them do maintenance. Let the parking enforcement officers go in there the same way we do the parking lots. Use hang tags. First floor is for the public and when they leave you can put in a pay and display for parking. Portsmouth does it and Concord does it. I think Concord does it and they don't even have security. This is a simple way to do it. When we went out to bid for the management companies they all said different things about each other. This guy doesn't put in exit loops to count how many cars are in there and how many freebies are in there. This would eliminate that whole thing. You, yourself, Alderman know that there has been some theft going on since the civic arena opened. I know you informed us of it. We never really found out what happened. You can attest to that. They were collected earlier than they were supposed to.

Alderman Lopez stated I am always concerned when we hire managers. We hired a manager in Economic Development and now he needs a bunch of worker bees, which we always said in the beginning. Is that what we are going to look at here? Are we going to have a manager come and let's say Denise you work for him you are going to be doing the same thing you are doing today? I just don't

understand...maybe somebody can explain to me why if our system is not broke and the parking recommendations...we got some good parking recommendations, 39 different things, that that couldn't be worked out with the responsible people on the Traffic Committee and bring up some recommendations and move forward. I think we are getting too carried away that we do not have expertise in the City and we have to go outside the City and hire somebody and I am a little leery of that. Then what happens? You get top management heavy. You have a secretary and you would become a secretary Denise and you will be doing the work. He goes to meetings. Those are the things I worry about when we start reorganizing. I think you have two capable people. Since 1969...my God did somebody fall asleep at the wheel? How many Mayors have we had? Anyway, that is for another day.

Alderman Forest asked Jim the electrician that you have now, I know there is one out sick and you have one electrician...

Mr. Hoben answered we have two. There are four in the department.

Alderman Forest asked you just hired a new one.

Mr. Hoben stated there is a Traffic Signal Foreman or supervisor, who is also an electrician. The one that is out is a Signal Technician.

Alderman Forest stated you just hired a signal technician.

Mr. Hoben responded he took the place of...the employee that is out now was out sick last year.

Alderman Forest stated the question I have is if the department is consolidated with Highway and this signal technician goes to Highway under union rules he would be the last guy in and would he get bumped out of a job at Highway by an older person.

Mr. Hoben responded from what I understand it is by classification. I think Frank clarified that.

Chairman O'Neil asked Mr. Thomas to come forward and clarify that issue.

Mr. Thomas stated I spoke to the AFSME union president and he confirms what I put in the memo to this Committee. That it is by class...it is department seniority and classification. So if there is a lower position that is eliminated for whatever reason, that position has the right to bump down to another position that he is qualified for by department seniority. You cannot bump up and eliminate a guy in

a higher classification just because the other classification has less seniority. So it is department seniority by classification.

Alderman Smith stated Frank you and I had a big discussion. The reason why I was asking Mr. Hoben how many electricians he has and four did you say including yourself? Well if you go to consolidation it says three here so that would mean that the senior man if it was Jim Hoben who is a master electrician he could bump the guy who was last hired.

Mr. Thomas responded that is not true because Jim Hoben is a non-affiliated employee. He does not have bumping rights. The three signal people that are electricians that are in the organization now are staying. They are not going anywhere under any of the proposals.

Alderman Smith stated I want to hear this correctly. You are telling me that a person that has been there 10 months will be able to keep his job over somebody that has been there for 32 years and has a license to do it?

Mr. Thomas responded that is correct because you have the union and non-affiliated positions. Non-affiliated employees cannot bump into union positions. The union has a contract. Now the three people that are in the signal section fall under the union contract so nobody is going to bump them out of their positions.

Alderman Smith stated I can understand where you are coming from but it seems very strange to me Mr. Chairman that if you have somebody with 32 years of experience and somebody with 10 months...it just doesn't seem right and maybe that is why we shouldn't consolidate Traffic at all.

Alderman Forest stated I think Denise short-changed herself when you asked her if she was qualified to take the manager's job. I think Denise is highly capable and could take it. In fact I talked to her several times about applying for one of those jobs and she didn't want to. Anyway, that is all I have to say.

Alderman DeVries stated the audit report that is due in, do you have any timeframe for when you think you might have that.

Mr. Hoben responded I have no idea. He has not even completed the whole thing.

Alderman DeVries asked the so-called stranded duties, services or whatever they are is that something that used to be done by your division.

Mr. Hoben answered it is like handed off. Someone takes it here. Parks takes it here. No one really has a handle on it. A lot of those meter pedestals are bent

over and knocked down downtown. No one has the time or no one has taken direction from the Board to repair them. It is almost like we do the snowflakes. We do the flags. Parks does the flags. We take care of Amoskeag lighting sometimes with Highway on an overtime basis. It is not really...there is no focus to repair these things. Like I said they are orphans. They are like a stepchild to the City. No one claims them. I requested another signal technician so we would have four in the field to take on these new duties, which would also include...it came up in a meeting and I think Alderman Lopez was there and it was the Ward 4 meeting that the parks lighting was out. We used to do park lighting repair on an overtime basis and it got to a point where our guys were getting burned out because they were on 24/7. Now they are on every other week 24/7. There is no...they have no family life. That is why I asked for another technician to give them some relief and take care of some of the problems and the neglect that is going on in the City.

Alderman DeVries stated I have an additional question for you, Jim, or it may be a Denise question. On your last page the third bullet from the bottom talks about establishing the Victory garage as metered permit parking and increasing rates. It talks about the hours of enforcement being Monday-Friday. Is that what you intended? So no Saturday enforcement?

Mr. Hoben replied right now there is no Saturday enforcement. It would be free parking. We are trying to keep it consistent because the PCO's would be enforcing it. The parking control officers would be going inside the garage to issue tickets.

Ms. Boutillier stated and the parking meters are enforced from 8 AM until 8 PM. We just thought it would make sense to keep everything in life from 8 AM until 8 PM.

Alderman Shea asked has your department ever requested a traffic engineer to your knowledge.

Mr. Hoben answered no not to my knowledge.

Alderman Shea asked do you think it is a necessary part of traffic as indicated by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Hoben answered it could be looking at subdivisions and new development but we have had a good relationship with Southern NH Planning. They have done many studies for us. David Preece who is the new Director is also doing studies for us on Bridge Street at no cost.



Alderman Shea asked does some of the allocation for that service come out of your expenditure.

Mr. Hoben answered it is free to us.

Alderman Shea asked there is no charge.

Mr. Hoben answered no.

Chairman O'Neil stated the City pays for it.

Alderman Shea asked how much.

Someone commented that \$68,000 has been budgeted for next year.

Alderman Shea stated well obviously that makes no sense. If that is part of it we should hire our own. Does that make any sense to anybody here? Frank, hire your own. My other question and again I am sure that you are getting tired and I thank you for waiting so long but my question is how much has your department turned back to the City in revenues. Is it like \$500,000? Is it \$6 million? What do you return to the City?

Mr. Hoben responded it is \$4 million.

Alderman Shea stated now the \$4 million, what happens to this. Does that go back to reduce the taxes or does some of it like \$2 million? Does anyone know?

Alderman Lopez stated I am not the Finance guy but \$4 million would go into the general fund and the expenses for the Traffic Department, let's say it was \$250,000 then that would be taken out.

Alderman Shea stated so basically then if we were to make an enterprise fund then that money that is now used to reduce taxes would not reduce taxes but the thinking on the other end is that the enterprise would make up for that difference. Is that correct?

Alderman Lopez responded well yes and...the enterprise would be self-sufficient as has been said and they would probably do a lot more in the enterprise system as the experts indicated but if you lost say \$150,000 that is \$150,000 that you lose on the income into the general fund that could cover other things and you would have to find other ways to do it because you couldn't use the enterprise money from traffic or parking to do that. It would be just strictly for that department just like the Parks & Recreation.

Chairman O'Neil stated some of these recommendations you made on parking, have you had a discussion with the consultant about them at all.

Mr. Hoben answered no we haven't.

Chairman O'Neil asked did the consultant reach out to you when he did his study.

Mr. Hoben answered he had interviews with us to just get information basically.

Chairman O'Neil asked but those recommendations weren't ready at that time.

Mr. Hoben asked these here, no they weren't.

Chairman O'Neil stated so we should make sure the consultant sees these for comment.

Chairman O'Neil called Paul Borek forward.

Alderman Lopez stated I know it is late but as you sat back there and listened to all of the conversations let's just say for the sake of argument that the parking would come under you. You as the professional Economic Development Director who has been hired by the City, could you give us some insight as to whether you think this is a good idea or not a good idea or what?

Paul Borek, Economic Development Director, stated since I have been here and understanding and reviewing the economic profile of the City and the business needs of the City, particularly of the Millyard and the downtown, and interacting with the consultant and reviewing the consultant study, I have come to believe that one of the most critical economic development issues that the City is facing at this moment is parking and the need for additional parking spaces and capability in the Millyard. I think if you ask the Traffic Division and the parking staff they would tell you that they are not able to issue any more parking spaces and yet on a weekly basis or greater building owners contact my office and sometimes parking and traffic about the availability of additional spaces because they want to bring on more employees. Either companies who are tenants in the buildings want to bring on more employees or building owners want to bring in more tenants or improve more spaces or upgrade spaces. There are some trends regarding space allocation that allow operating companies and tenants to build cubicles and bring in more people, all of which provides more jobs and more livelihood and revenue to residents of the general area, some of which are residents of Manchester, but overall it contributes to the strength and vitality of the Manchester area economy and the economy affects all of our communities and the strength of the economy.

I believe that putting in place a system that enables us to best utilize the parking that we have and to help us identify ways to generate new parking is essential because what will happen if we do not generate new parking is that some of the tenants that lease spaces in the buildings in the Millyard now, if they are constrained from growing because they can't find parking they will move.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to know if we said to you, Paul Borek, after it went through the process and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen said we are going to give you the parking and we are going to give you Denise who has been running the parking all this time and you are in charge of parking in the City of Manchester and you are her immediate supervisor do you think that would work.

Mr. Borek responded I think a system could work in conjunction with...I think I could make a system work in conjunction with working with the parking consultant to put in place the best and most advisable transition plan and system to move from a current system to an enterprise.

Alderman Lopez asked do you want a worker bee or do you want another manager.

Mr. Borek replied that is a good question. I can tell you that I am not professionally trained nor do I have experience in managing a comprehensive parking system within a municipality. I am not particularly knowledgeable in terms of new technologies and new systems so given my responsibilities for overall marketing and economic development for the City I would want to have a professional with experience and training or some combination of experience and training to handle the responsibility.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think for the next time we meet we should have the HR Director here prepared to speak on the various topics. We should make sure that she gets the minutes of tonight's meeting. We should have the Risk Manager here I believe unless Randy clarified that issue. Is there any need for the Risk Manager to be here? Were you satisfied with Randy's clarification Alderman Lopez?

Alderman Lopez responded I would like the Risk Manager here at the next meeting.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we have an understanding of the bumping issue and all of that but if would please everyone we will have the Chief Negotiator here as well. Just a comment before we table this. There is going to be a stand off in the next two years on this thing and I don't know that that is good for anyone involved. It certainly is not good for the employees of the Traffic Department. It is certainly not good for their fellow City employees who have a hand in on this

thing in one way or the other. It is not good for the users of the system – the parking system. I think we have to come up with something that is going to bring some closure to this thing one way or the other. Our two most recent Mayors have proposed this. It is an issue that is not going to go away unless we make some movement on this. I think we do have an obligation to our employees. I don't think there is anyone sitting here that doesn't feel that way. I would just hope that people will keep an open mind on how we can come up with something that will meet the objectives of all. Otherwise, we are going to be going through this again next year.

Alderman DeVries stated I would just add to those comments that from reading both of the proposals, the one from Traffic and the one from Finance/Mayor Guinta they both were indicating that a parking enterprise was in order if I read them correctly. I don't think there is any doubt that this Committee is interested in taking a look at the parking enterprise to see if there are improvements to the parking system that should be made and could be made.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to table this item.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee